



Class BS 2375

Book .B6

Copyright N^o _____

COPYRIGHT DEPOSIT.



HISTORICAL EVIDENCE

OF THE

NEW TESTAMENT.

AN INDUCTIVE STUDY IN CHRISTIAN EVIDENCES.

THE FACTS MENTIONED IN THE NEW TESTAMENT DEMONSTRATED TO BE
HISTORICAL BY THE WORST ENEMIES OF CHRISTIANITY WHO LIVED
IN THE FIRST THREE CENTURIES OF OUR ERA, CONFIRMED BY
AS MANY CHRISTIAN WRITERS OF FAME, CONTEMPORARIES WHO
WROTE IN DIFFERENT COUNTRIES AND PERIODS: THE WHOLE
RECONFIRMED BY MANY REMARKABLE EVIDENCES
RECENTLY DISCOVERED: ANCIENT DOCUMENTS,
MONUMENTS, ARCHES, INSCRIPTIONS, COINS,
SUPERSCRPTIONS, AND
CHRISTIAN ART.

Εἰδότες ὅτι εἰς ἀπολογίαν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου κείμεναι.

"I am set for the Defense of the Gospel."—TO THE PHILIPPIANS.

"For we have not any power against the Truth, but in behalf of the Truth."
—TO THE CORINTHIANS.

BY

REV. S. L. BOWMAN, A. M., S. T. D.

CINCINNATI: JENNINGS AND PYE.
NEW YORK: EATON AND MAINS.

BS2375
B6

25112*

LIBRARY of CONGRESS
Two Copies Received
DEC 30 1903
Copyright Entry
Jan. 18-1904
CLASS a Xxc. No.
772 J J
COPY 3

COPYRIGHT, 1903, BY
JENNINGS AND PYE.

WALTON
SECOND

2. 18 Jan 4 1/2

To My Wife.

PREFACE.

THIS treatise is a contribution to the *Christian Evidences* demanded by the times. It is dedicated to the intelligent young men of the period. The work is designed to meet the skeptical issues of the day which deny the historical character of Christianity during the first three centuries, holding that the claim is not absolutely based upon the facts of Christ's life as is narrated in the four Gospels. No other work known to the writer has proposed to traverse this territory upon the lines and in the form here adopted. It embraces the period between the crucifixion of Christ and the time when Constantine the Great established Christianity throughout the Roman Empire as the religion of the State in A. D. 325. After this date there is no question made touching the historicity of Christianity.

Paley's *Evidences* nobly met the requirements of his age; but new issues have risen since which call for a restatement of the Christian argument in a more comprehensive form, fortified by the *monumental evidences* of recent discovery. As Dr. Philip Schaff judiciously remarks: "Lardner, Doddridge, and Leland made good use of Celsus against the Deists of their day. *He may with still greater effect be turned against Strauss and Renan.*" (*Person of Christ*, p. 101, note.) Mr. George Rawlinson also observes: "*It is important to bear in mind the fact that there is no period in the whole range of ancient history whereof we possess a more full and exact knowledge than we do of the first century of our era.*" (*Truth of the Scripture Records*, Amer. ed. 383, Note 3.

The method of procedure is to employ the testimonies of *the adversaries of Christianity* who lived in the first centuries of our era indicated, *to confirm* the statements of the apostolic writers, and *prove the historicity of the facts related in the sacred narratives*. The writers hostile to the Christian religion are of two classes,—Jewish and heathen. Of the Jews the testimony adduced is that taken from the works of Josephus, the Talmud, the Toledoth Jeshu (*History of Jesus*), and a few others, such as the recent *History of the Jews* by Dr. Heinrich Graetz, a professor in the University of Breslau, Prussia; of the heathen, the testimony of Tacitus, Pliny, Suetonius, Lucian, Celsus, Porphyry, and the Emperor Julian as the connecting link between the primitive and the later Christianity acknowledged to be historical. The testimony of the Friends of Christianity, who were the contemporaries of the Adversaries, is that of the Apostolic Fathers, the Christian Apologists, and the first four Pauline Epistles, which are now acknowledged, by all living skeptics of character, to be authentic and credible. The testimony of the Christian writers is employed to *confirm the testimony of their enemies* respecting the facts alleged in the historical part of the New Testament. Then this mass of testimony is *reconfirmed* by the new “finds”—the Documents, Monuments, Arches, Inscriptions, Coins, Superscriptions, and Christian Art.

Respecting the value of monumental evidence, Dr. Philip Schaff remarks:

“The importance of these literary discoveries and investigations should not blind us to the almost equally important monumental discoveries and researches of Cavalier de Rossi, Garrucci, and other Italian scholars who have illuminated the subterranean mysteries of the Church of Rome and of early Christian art. Neander, Gieseler, and Baur, the greatest Church historians of the nineteenth century, are as silent about the catacombs as Mosheim and Gibbon were in the eighteenth. But

who could now write a history of the first three centuries without recording the lessons of those rude yet expressive pictures, sculptures and epitaphs from the homes of confessors and martyrs? Nor should we overlook the gain which has come to us from the study of monumental inscriptions, as, for instance, in rectifying the date of Polycarp's martyrdom, who is brought ten years nearer the age of St. John." (*Hist. of Christian Church*, Vol. II; *Preface*, p. vii.)

Where new witnesses are introduced, there will be found before each chapter an epitome of the life and works of those testifying. The object of this is to furnish the young reader some knowledge of the character of the attesting party, as a proper preparation to appreciate the value of his testimony. Acknowledgment is specially due for the use made of Dr. Nathaniel Lardner's great work consisting of ten volumes: *a thesaurus* of learning and apologetic literature. As he has usually furnished his citations in the language in which they were originally written, in some instances this author has made his own translations therefrom; but in all cases where critical care and consideration were regarded as specially due, the rendering found place in the text of the page, that the English reader might experience no break in the continuity of thought; and the original of the citation was placed in the foot-note with proper reference, which the scholarly reader would most desire to see.

An Appendix may be found at the end of this volume containing valuable matter which could not well be placed in the body of the work. Attention is specially directed to Josephus's *Testimony of Christ* for the reason that all the principal arguments *pro* and *con* are there adduced respecting the genuineness of this famous paragraph. The reader is to determine for himself whether the testimony is of evidential value in the course of this discussion. Pliny's *Official Letter* to the Emperor Trajan is there given in full. *The Logia of our Lord* in

Greek and its translation; *The Didaché, or Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*, and the celebrated *Muratorian Canon* are there noted and described. In an *Excursus* is given the Jews' authoritative Edict for expurgating all references to Jesus Christ, with particular reference to opprobrious language applied to him in their Talmud. *Tabular Exhibits* are super-added for reference.

That this volume may prove to be a blessing of helpfulness to the faith of the rising young men of the country, who may have perplexities of doubt respecting the historicity of the New Testament Scriptures, and consequently of the primitive Christianity, is the sincere and devout wish of the

AUTHOR.

NEW YORK, 1903.

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER	PAGE
INTRODUCTION, - - - - -	vii
I. GENERAL ANTICIPATIONS OF THE COMING MESSIAH, - - -	19
II. THE NATIVITY OF THE LORD JESUS CHRIST, - - -	41
III. CIRCUMSTANCES CONCURRENT WITH HIS NATIVITY, - - -	63
IV. UNIQUE PLACE OF JOHN THE BAPTIST IN HISTORY, - - -	91
V. THE HISTORICAL CHRIST AND ANCIENT CHRISTIANITY, - - -	113
VI. THE PROOF OF MIRACLES WROUGHT BY JESUS CHRIST, - - -	139
VII. CHARACTERISTICS AND VALUE OF CHRIST'S MIRACLES, - - -	161
VIII. MODERN OBJECTIONS TO THE MIRACLES OF CHRIST, - - -	181
IX. THE PASSION, THE DEATH, AND THE BURIAL OF JESUS, - - -	211
X. THE RESURRECTION OF JESUS CHRIST FROM THE DEAD, - - -	233
XI. THE ASCENSION OF THE LORD JESUS INTO HEAVEN, - - -	295
XII. THE APOSTLES OF JESUS CHRIST AND THEIR WORK, - - -	313
XIII. THE PERSECUTIONS OF THE PRIMITIVE CHRISTIANS, - - -	343
XIV. UNIQUE HISTORY OF PALESTINE FOR FIFTY YEARS, - - -	385
XV. THE ROMAN RULERS OF THE JEWS, AND THE NEW TESTAMENT, - - -	413
XVI. THE HOUSE OF THE HERODS, AND THE NEW TESTAMENT, - - -	459
XVII. DESTRUCTION OF THE JEWISH NATION, AND THE NEW TESTAMENT, - - -	501
XVIII. PAUL'S MISSIONARY JOURNEYS TO THE GENTILE WORLD, - - -	555
XIX. VERIFICATION OF THE NEW TESTAMENT AS HISTORICAL, - - -	585
XX. MANUSCRIPTS, VERSIONS, AND CANON OF THE NEW TESTAMENT, - - -	633

APPENDIX.

EXCURSUS	
A. TESTIMONY OF JOSEPHUS RESPECTING JESUS CHRIST, - - -	665
B. PLINY'S STATE PAPER ADDRESSED TO EMPEROR TRAJAN, - - -	671
C. THE LOGIA OF OUR LORD, OR, "THE SAYINGS OF JESUS," - - -	673
D. DIDACHÉ, OR, "THE TEACHING OF THE TWELVE APOSTLES," - - -	674
E. "THE MURATORIAN CANON:" DESCRIPTION AND VALUE, - - -	675
F. THE TALMUD EXPURGATED OF ITS REFERENCES TO JESUS, - - -	676
G. EXTRACTS FROM THE JEWISH WORK, "THE TOLEDOTH JESHU," - - -	678
EXHIBIT	
A. CHRONOLOGY OF THE BOOKS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT, - - -	687
B. HIGH PRIESTS AND PROCURATORS OF PALESTINE, - - -	689
C. COMPARATIVE TABLE OF THE CRITICS RESPECTING TESTIMONIES, - - -	690
D. TABLE OF CONTEMPORARY WITNESSES AND DOCUMENTS, - - -	691
E. CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE OF ALL WITNESSES CITED IN THIS WORK, - - -	693
INDEX, - - - - -	695

O that mine enemy would write a book. . . . I would bind it to me as a crown.—JOB.

For their rock is not as our Rock, even our enemies themselves being judges.—MOSES.

Fas est ab hoste doceri: "It is right to be taught by an enemy."—ROMAN MOTTO.

"Ἐτοιμοὶ δὲ αἰεὶ πρὸς ἀπολογίαν παντὶ τῷ αἰτοῦντι ὑμᾶς λόγον περὶ τῆς ἐν ὑμῖν ἐλπίδος.

But ready always for every one asking you a reason in respect to a defense concerning the hope in you.—PETER.

For what fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness? And what communion hath light with darkness? And what concord hath Christ with Belial? Or what part hath he that believeth with an infidel?—PAUL.

INTRODUCTION.

THE CONSPECTUS.

§ 1. *The Proposition.* A Scheme of Evidence is to be introduced embracing hundreds of circumstances recorded in the *historical* New Testament related to the origin, antiquity, and authenticity of those Scriptures. Among others, will be embraced those capital facts and truths upon which Christianity was founded, and upon which it has ever securely reposed. The argument based upon these occurrences will be conducted informally upon the *Inductive rather than the Deductive principle*, proceeding from *the facts* rather than from *propositions* to the conclusions.

§ 2. *Plan of the Work.* The arrangement following will sufficiently indicate the character and scope of the investigation proposed in this treatise:

- I. The Gospel and the Christ of History.
- II. The Gospel and the Work of Christ.
- III. The Gospel and the Public of Palestine.
- IV. The Gospel and the Roman Rulers.
- V. The Gospel and the Jewish Rulers.
- VI. The Gospel and the Jewish Nation.
- VII. The Gospel and the Gentile World.

§ 3. *Witness of Enemies.* Those occurrences referred to as basal to the Christian religion are to be substantiated upon the testimony of *twenty ancient Adversaries* of Christianity who were Roman, Greek, and Jewish writers of antiquity and eminence. They were the contemporaries of the apostles and their successors, all of whom were very unfriendly, and most of whom were the worst enemies that Christianity ever had. Their testimony is preferred because of their known hostility

to the Christian cause, which gives an added value to their witness. Of these twenty adversaries, nineteen lived within the first three centuries after the crucifixion of Christ, ten of whom were the contemporaries of the apostles and of the events recorded in the several Gospels; five or six were the contemporaries of the Apostolic Fathers, the pupils and immediate successors of the apostles; and the remaining three were the contemporaries of the Christian Apologists living at a remove of one or two generations later. The twentieth witness reigned on the imperial throne of Rome, and wrote not long after Constantine the Great had established Christianity as the religion of the State throughout the Roman Empire. His testimony may be regarded as furnishing a connecting link in the history of the sub-Apostolic Christianity, and that which has existed ever since. After the adoption of the Christian religion in the Roman world, there is no question entertained touching its historicity.

It is to be noted, however, that these twenty adversaries who attest the truth of the sacred record, do not all testify to each one of the hundreds of facts to be adduced. For one may make reference to one fact, and another may mention several facts; while a third may confirm the first two testimonies, and perhaps give additional details. But the several testimonies are to be taken together to prove, beyond a rational doubt, the historical antiquity and authenticity of the record claimed; furnishing a broad basis for the induction that the entire content of the New Testament respecting the founding and diffusion of the Christian religion is both ancient and true.

Now, the negative contention of ancient infidels really makes for the Christian cause. Even their denial at the times they severally lived is a tacit admission that there had previously existed an account regarded by others as historical related to cardinal Christian facts. For why should any man deny that which no one had ever affirmed? Or why should

books be written to refute what nobody had asserted? Or why should men have been persecuted and martyred for their faith, if there existed absolutely no ground for their believing? If the religion of the Christians was founded on nothing more substantial than an innocent fancy, what reason is to be assigned that an opposition arose so fierce that it put men to death? If we run backward through the earlier centuries of our era, we shall find in each generation that there existed an account of the occurrence of facts which were the ground of the faith that then existed, an account which antedated the opposition and its generation, until we reach the Founder of Christianity himself, by whom, and in respect to whom, came those occurrences which have inspired the world.

Furthermore, it is not the function of historical evidence to *compel* belief. It is not required that any question shall be placed beyond the ability of an unreasonable man to doubt; for whoever is determined to disbelieve can do so, whatever just grounds exist for conviction. But the mental attitude of such a disputant is that of self-stultification. It satisfies all legitimate demands in reasoning that evidence of such character be adduced as commands that high degree of probability which renders a belief in the contrary conclusion *irrational*. In short, as reasoning men we have no right to believe without reason, and we have no right to disbelieve when we have the reason. Mere prejudice is not reasoning or reasonable. "He that judgeth before he heareth is not wise." Mere opinion is not evidence, and can not be substituted for evidence. A denial based upon ignorance of facts at issue can never be taken as disproof of the facts affirmed to be unhistorical. Rather all mere assertions and assumptions leave absolutely untouched the historicity of questions under consideration.

§ 4. *Witness of Friends.* The testimony of the friends of Christianity is reserved to *confirm the testimony of its enemies*. The two classes were contemporaries. This corroborative

testimony will be drawn from three sources of the Christian writers, viz.:

a) *The Apostolic Fathers*, who were the personal Disciples of the Apostles;

β) *The Christian Apologists*, or Defenders of the Faith, who wrote later; and

γ) *The first four Pauline Epistles*, now universally conceded to be authentic and credible.

§ 5. *Witness of Antiquities*. This kind of testimony is that furnished by ancient *Documents* recently discovered, by *Public Monuments, Arches, Coins, Inscriptions, Superscriptions, and by Christian Art*. Archæological testimony applies not to all Christian facts, but to many and sufficient. Whenever applicable, this sort of testimony will be adduced for the purpose of *recorroboration of the foregoing testimonies*. Its evidential value in history is very great and decisive, since it is impossible to conceive that such public affairs could be publicly imposed upon a given community and be groundless, or be done by fraud.

§ 6. *Witnesses Classified*. Both adverse and friendly witnesses, as giving weight to their testimony, may here be classed according to their *Rank and Profession* among men.

ADVERSARIES OF CHRISTIANITY.

Physicians. One: Galen.

Classic Writers. Three: Martial, Juvenal, and Vergil.

Philosophers. Five: Seneca, Epictetus, Lucian, Celsus, and Porphyry.

Historians. Five: Strabo, Josephus, Tacitus, Suetonius, and Dion Cassius.

Roman Proconsuls. Two: Pliny the Younger, and Hierocles.

Roman Emperors. Four: Trajan, Hadrian, Aurelius, and Julian.

Jewish Authors. *Many*: (1) of the *Talmud*; (2) of the *Toledoth Jeshu*.

ADVOCATES OF CHRISTIANITY.

Apostles of Jesus Christ. One: Paul.

Apostolic Fathers. Four: Barnabas, Clement, Ignatius, and Polycarp.

Other Patristic Witnesses. Two: Irenæus a Bishop, and Clement a Teacher, of Alexandria.

Christian Apologists. Five: Quadratus, Melito, Tertullian, Apollonius, and Lactantius.

Christian Philosophers. Four: Aristides, Justin Martyr, Apollonius, and Origen.

Christian Historians. Three: Hegesippus, Eusebius, and Lactantius.

Roman Emperors. One: Constantine the Great.

§ 7. *Historical Evidence.* The *characteristics and method of procedure*, in case of historical evidence, differ very materially from those of an ordinary court of trial. At the bar of *Criticism* there are no living issues on matters of past centuries, no living parties in contention, and no living witnesses to command in proof. There is no open court to investigate the facts in the case, and no direct and cross-examination of those testifying to test the validity of given claims. However, when the evidence sought is documentary as in case of the Scriptures, critical consideration is necessitated respecting the authorship, the antiquity, the authenticity and credibility of the case. The genuineness or the spuriousness of the text, the usage of specific words at the date claimed as a time-test, the material on which the writing appears, and the mode of the writing itself then in vogue, are searchingly examined as against forgery and fraud, the custody of the writing as against interpolations, and the accordancy of the contents with current events known from contemporaneous history.

Other sources of information are also open to careful and critical consideration, such as the testimony of contemporaries of the writer of the document, official correspondence of offi-

cers and rulers, official governmental records, the existence of public monuments commemorative of special occasions involved, historical inscriptions found in public places, coins bearing images and superscriptions, works of art illustrative of facts and customs then existent; in short, appeal may be made to any archæological proofs discovered relating to the case in hand. Finally the fairness and credibility of the historian himself in his interpretation of the facts involved and the reliability of the *data* upon which he has depended, are matters for consideration. On such evidence and by such methods must historical investigation proceed. Of course, no historian is required to have been himself an eye-witness of the occurrences which he is properly called upon to interpret and record. It certainly is not his function necessarily to write as a witness. He writes legitimately and credibly when he estimates the evidential value of the facts which happened centuries before he was born. By no means does it render nugatory his statements of history that others than the historian were the original witnesses of the facts which it is his part to place upon the historic page.

§ 8. *Value of Added Witnesses.* Bishop Butler in his celebrated *Analogy* remarks: "*Probable proofs, by being added, not only increase the evidence, but multiply it.*" Mr. George Rawlinson, in his *Bampton Lectures* (1859), says: "*When two independent writers witness to the same event, the probability of that event is increased; not in arithmetical, but in geometrical ratio; not by mere addition, but by multiplication.*"*

That is, the ratio of the credibility to the discredibility is as 100 to 1. Let it be assumed as 10 to 1 that a given event occurred upon the testimony of one witness, and the second witness, of equal credibility, testifies to the same fact. Then the evidence furnished is not 20 to 1 upon the testimony of two witnesses, but 120 to 1. And if three witnesses of equal credibility be taken, the credibility will be to the discredibility

*See Wentworth's *College Algebra*, page 268.

as 1,330 to 1, in the final chances. Accordingly, it is of paramount importance that this principle be kept carefully in sight in the discussion which is to follow, that the true value of the evidence adduced may be duly appreciated in respect to the authenticity and credibility of the New Testament as proposed in this treatise.

§ 9. *Criteria of Testimony.* In determining the eligibility of witnesses and the validity of their testimony in historical investigation, a just criterion is had in order to discriminate between the true and the false, or the questionable. A few authorities may be cited on judicial procedures, as well as on the credibility of historical treatises, touching the admissibility of different testimonies when they are variant, the proper disposition of conflicting evidence, reports derived from original witnesses, and the proper custody of documents which have come down to us from ancient times. These may be reduced to four in number:

a) *Canon of Divergent Testimonies.*

1. Statements of substantial truth, with circumstantial variety in detail and expression.
2. Testimony of the original witnesses, when it is confirmed by the testimony of enemies.
3. The testimony given when contrary to the interests of the witnesses testifying.
4. The original witnesses testifying possessing stainless characters.

β) *Conflicting Testimonies Reconciled.* Thomas Starkie says:

“In case of a seeming conflict in the evidence, it is legitimate to reconcile the differences by the facts involved; but if the data for composing the discrepancies supposed can not be found in the evidence itself, a rational hypothesis to explain the difficulty is admissible.” (*Law of Evidence*, 8th Amer. edition.)

γ) *Reports of Original Witnesses.* Sir George Cornwall Lewis says:

“Accounts . . . derived directly or indirectly from original witnesses . . . may be considered as presumptively entitled to credit.” (*Credibility of Early Roman History*, 1856.)

δ) *Custody of Ancient Documents.* Simon Greenleaf says:

“Documents found in a place in which, and under the care of persons with whom such papers might naturally and reasonably be expected to be found, or in possession of persons having an interest in them, are precisely in the custody which gives authenticity to documents found in it.”

After his citation of cases, he adds this note:

“The rule stated in the text is one of the grounds on which we insist on the genuineness of the books of the Holy Scriptures. They are found in the proper custody or place where they have been kept from time immemorial. They have been constantly referred to as the foundation of the faith by all the sects whose existence God in his wisdom has seen fit to permit; whose zealous vigilance would readily detect any attempt to falsify the text, and whose divergence of creeds would render any mutual combination morally impossible. The burden of proof is therefore on the objector, to impeach the genuineness of the books, not upon the Christian to establish it.” (*Law of Evidence*, edition 1853, § 142.)

THE PROSPECTUS.

Attention is now directed briefly to the territory to be raversed in this treatise. The political condition of the country occupied by the Jews, wherein all the events related in the Gospels are said to have occurred, will naturally be considered; the times and rulers of the land, the language and customs of the people; their conditions under the imperial government, and the common anticipations of the Coming One who was known as the predicted Ruler of the world. But *the main facts* narrated in the historical part of the New Testament, such as the Nativity of Christ, His Ministry and Miracles, His Life and Death, His Resurrection and Ascension, together with hundreds of minute circumstances of incidental mention therein, will pass duly under review in critical inquiry. For it is the purpose of this investigation to demonstrate in a judicial spirit, the truth of the contents of these Scriptures whose teachings are held to be based absolutely upon the facts mentioned.

If it shall be found that these Scriptural statements are

confirmed by those who were absolutely hostile to Christianity, by those who sought to destroy the faith and even to destroy the Sacred Books themselves—the contemporaries of the Christian writers adduced—how can the book itself be false? What better proof can be given or demanded on any question whatever of the historical past? For as Dr. Philip Schaff, the great historian of the Christian Church, justly remarks: “*There is no historical work of ancient times which carries on its face such a seal of truthfulness as these [four] Gospels.*”

CHAPTER I.

ANTICIPATIONS OF MESSIAH.

- I. LITERATURE: VERGIL, JEWISH TALMUD, CHALDAIC TARGUMS.
- II. THE GOLDEN AGE AND EXPECTATIONS ENTERTAINED.
- III. SCRIPTURAL REVELATIONS RESPECTING MESSIAH.
- IV. THE JEWISH TALMUD AND THE INCARNATE MESSIAH.
- V. THE CHALDAIC TARGUMS AND THE EXPECTED MESSIAH.
- VI. ANTICIPATIONS ENTERTAINED BY OTHER NATIONS.
- VII. TESTIMONY OF ADVERSARIES MISPLACING THE ADVENT. VERGIL—
JOSEPHUS—SUTONIUS—TACITUS—CELSUS.
- VIII. CRITICAL CONSIDERATIONS AND INDUCTIONS:
 - a) *The Fact Predicted.*
 - β) *The Person Predicted.*
 - γ) *The Time Predicted.*

HISTORICAL EVIDENCE OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

CHAPTER I.

ANTICIPATIONS OF THE MESSIAH.

§ 10. Sources: Biographical Epitome of Witness and Literature.

1. VERGIL was a Latin poet of fame, born B. C. 70, and died B. C. 19. In early life he resided in Rome and Naples, Italy. He was of delicate constitution, both in body and mind, and was a man of very gentle character. Carefully educated, he developed a genius for writing poetry, accordant with the classic style and Roman standard. Among the most famous of his literary productions which have come down to us, are two works designated *Eclogæ*, consisting of ten bucolics, written about B. C. 41-39. In *Eclogæ* iv, he makes distinct reference to the return of "*the Golden Age*" as the common hope of the nations in his time, expressed in the anticipated *personal incarnation* of "*A Holy Progeny who descends from heaven*" to men.
2. THE TALMUD, in Jewish literature, a Code of traditions held in nearly the same valuation and veneration as their Hebrew Scriptures. The entire work embraces twelve large folio volumes. It has two principal parts: the Mishna, or the text, and the Gemára, or commentary of explanations.

a) *The Mishna*, meaning "repetition" of the Law, is a work said to have been begun by Ezra and his successors upon their return from Babylon to Jerusalem. When they disappeared from the scene, the Sanhedrin assumed tribunal functions. After some centuries had passed, an immense mass of traditionary matter had accumulated, embracing many contradictory opinions and decisions; whereupon academies arose at Jerusalem, which became famous for digesting and propagating this stock of traditions. Hillel the elder, a Babylonian by birth, was installed at Jerusalem as Patriarch of Palestine, B. C. 32. He arranged the Mishna into six chief divisions, called *Sedarim*, meaning *orders*, viz.: (1) Seraim, "seeds" or "field products;" (2) Moed, "festivals;" (3) Nashim, "laws of women;" (4) Nesikim, "legal provisions;"

(5) *Kodeshim*, "sacred things;" (6) *Toharoth*, "distinguishing between the clean and unclean." Each division was subdivided into *Mesachtoth*, or tracts, sixty-three in number.

The Jews of the true faith study the Mishna with the most venerating care. It is claimed that its traditions and expositions were derived orally from Moses and were reduced in final form by the celebrated Rabbi Jehudah, or Judah "the holy," who received the code from the earlier Rabbis, and they from Simon the Just, the last survivor of Ezra's Great Synagogue; that the Synagogue received the same from the Seventy Elders appointed by Moses, who received it from Joshua, who received it from Moses, who received it from God! It was written about B. C. 400-A. D. 200.

β) *The Gemára*, "complement" in the sense of the *authoritative interpretation* of the Law. That is, the Pentateuch was the *authoritative written Law*, and the *Gemára its commentary*, furnishing a code of "completion" or "perfection" such as to render all further additions inadmissible! As soon as the Mishna was reduced to writing and published, their chief Rabbis wrote commentaries upon the work. It therefore exhibits those traditions of the Pharisees which Jesus denounced so severely as unauthorized. (Matt. xv, 1-9.)

There were two great centers of Rabbis engaged in writing the *Gemára*, and two works produced. The older one was called the Jerusalem or the Palestinian *Gemára*, because composed by the Rabbis of that country, whose center was the city of Tiberias in the later centuries. It was in one large folio, and published towards the close of the fourth century. The other, called the Babylonian *Gemára* was composed by the Rabbis of the further East under the supervision of the Patriarch of Babylon, and was completed about a century later. It contains thirty-six tractates. Of the two works, the Babylonian is regarded as much the better, especially as exhibiting the manners and customs in the times of the Scriptures of the New Testament. This work contains 2,947 folio pages. (See *Excursus F*, in Appendix.)

3. THE CHALDAIC TARGUMS. Of these there are several. They are translations or *paraphrases* of most of the Hebrew Scriptures, omitting only the books Nehemiah, Ezra, and Daniel. They were written in the later Aramaic or Chaldee language when the Hebrew began to fall into decay. Critical opinion dates those which are regarded as most ancient and most valuable in the first Christian century, and certainly before the destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple under Titus A. D. 70. The Targums were long preserved by *oral* transmission after the return from the captivity of Babylon. There are two held in high appreciation, called Onkelos, which is based on the Pentateuch, and another called Jonathan ben Uzziel, which

is based upon the Hebrew prophets. They serve to illustrate the contemporary view and the prior teachings respecting the expected Messiah of the Jews, especially those views entertained at the time of the Nativity of Jesus Christ.

§ 11. Messianic Expectations.

The Fall in Paradise reduces to a practical form the noble legend of the Golden Age, cherished especially in prehistoric Greece.—GLADSTONE.

The expectation of a Golden Age that should return to earth was common in all the heathen nations.—DR. EZRA ABBOT.

I would with such perfection govern, to excel the Golden Age.—SHAKESPEARE.

I will give Thee for a Covenant of the people, for a Light of the Gentiles.—ISAIAH.

The Desire of Nations shall come; and I will fill this house with glory, saith the Lord of Hosts.—HAGGAI.

And we have the Word of Prophecy made more sure, whereunto ye do well to take heed, as unto a lamp shining in a dark place until the day dawn, and the Day-star arise in your hearts.—PETER.

ARGUMENT.

Ancient writings were numerous in the literature of different languages, anticipating the advent of One who was to be born in Palestine, and become the Ruler of the world. This expectation, common in all the best civilizations, looked for his descent from heaven in the Golden Age of mankind. At first it was the period for the realization which was so frequently voiced by pagan poet and historian, but gradually the conviction developed that an Unknown Person, in whom would center all interests, would appear in that "great Age to come."

The literature of this apprehension, however, was due to the authoritative prediction of the Hebrew prophets, who, again, referred the origin of the notion to a revelation from God. The people idealized the hope for a secular monarchy. If it shall be found that this was a misplacement of the predictions given, the inquiry will be legitimated whether all the lines of prophecy, and the lines of history alike, do not center in the person of Jesus Christ, whose coming when he did, and establishing a *Spiritual Kingdom*, has, in the highest sense, introduced the *Golden Age of Mankind*, and that *Jesus alone in his imperishable Character and Influence, is entitled to be known as THE MAN OF HISTORY.*

1. The Golden Age as Preparation for Messiah's Advent.
2. Scripture and Talmudic Teachings of His Incarnation.
3. Testimonies of Adversaries who misinterpret the Facts.
4. Critical Considerations, and the Inductions Warranted.

MESSIANIC EXPECTATIONS.

The foremost civilizations of antiquity lived in the expectation of the return of the Golden Age. Classic writers* never § 12. Golden Age. wearied of mentioning their belief in the recurrence of that period of primeval happiness and innocence from which they were conscious that the race had once departed. The pagans referred this return to the reign of Saturn. In classic literature, the Golden Age began with the time of Livius Andronicus,¹ and extended to the death of the Emperor Augustus.² For a long period, however, this ideal remained as a beautiful dream, having no reference to a Person, or to Royalty, or to Divinity, or to an Incarnation. At length, other influences were at work molding the nations to a better apprehension.

In making his march of conquests³ through Asiatic countries, Alexander the Great brought with him the Greek letters and language which became the medium of international intercourse and commerce. It is related that Ptolemy Philadelphus, of Egypt, made request⁴ of the Jews of Palestine to have seventy Rabbis sent down to Alexandria to translate the Old Testament Scriptures into the common Greek, that a copy might have place in the famous Alexandrine Library. Hence this Greek translation is known by the number engaged in the work of translation—the Septuagint. The effect of this movement was to give to the nations the teachings of the Hebrew Scriptures, which served to mold the expectations respecting the Golden Age into an apprehension of a Divine Person who should descend from heaven, whose advent became the central thought of the Golden Age. Hence Vergil, about forty years before the Nativity of Jesus, wrote:

The last Age decreed by the Fates is come,
And a new frame of all things doth begin;

*The principal classic writers who refer to the Golden Age were Plautus, Terence, Lucretius, Catullus, Cæsar, Cicero, Sallust, Propertius, Vergil, Tibullus, Livy, Ovid, Horace, and Hesiod (*Works and Days*, 109).

¹ B. C. 250.

² A. D. 14.

³ B. C. 333.

⁴ A. D. 280.

A HOLY PROGENY FROM HEAVEN DESCENDS
 Auspicious in his birth, which puts an end
 To the Iron Age, from which shall arise
 The Golden Age, most glorious to behold!⁵

The narrative of the Fall in Genesis furnishes the first promise of a Redeemer. The promise, which was predictive in character, was coeval with the expulsion of § 13. The Scriptures. our first parents from Paradise. But the prediction was expressed in terms so general that, in effect, it was as broad as the race of man. Meantime there would be constant conflict, and a final conquest. God said: "I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed: it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise [snap at] his heel."⁶ But here is no restriction to a given time or place or person for the realization. The hope is dim and distant, but accordant with the simplicity of the primitive faith. However the promise then, it was reserved for after ages to unfold the supreme meaning in a series of gradual and progressive revelations. These came at each crisis in the world's providential history, when the promise narrowed more and more, and the world's hope received in each instance added details and new inspiration related to the Messiah. In the passage of the ages, the Messianic thought became gradually but amply developed.

It was not until the time of Abraham that they knew from what *nation* the expected Messiah should come: "I will bless them that bless thee, . . . and in thee shall all the families of the earth be blessed."⁷ Then were realized the words of Jesus: "Your father Abraham rejoiced to see my day: he saw it and was glad!"⁸ It was not until the death of Jacob that they knew from what *tribe* he should be found: "Judah, thou art he whom thy brethren shall praise. . . . The scepter shall not depart from Judah nor a lawgiver from between his feet, until Shiloh⁹ come, and unto him shall the gathering

⁵ Ecloge iv.⁶ Gen. iii, 15.⁷ Gen. xii, 3.⁸ John viii, 56.⁹ שִׁלּוֹה, *Peace-maker, i. e. Messiah*, from שָׁלוֹם *rest*.

of the people be." The Book of Revelation supplements the statement by the expression: "Behold the Lion of the tribe of Judah: the Root of David hath prevailed."¹⁰ It was not until the time of David that they knew of what *family* Messiah would come: "The Lord hath sworn in truth unto David . . . Of the fruit of thy body will I set upon thy throne."¹¹ "I will establish the throne of his kingdom forever."¹² "In that day there shall be a fountain opened in the house of David . . . for sin and for uncleanness."¹³ It was not until the time of Isaiah that they knew what character of woman should give him birth: "Therefore the Lord himself shall give you a sign. Behold, a virgin shall conceive and bear a Son, and shall call his name Immanuel," which Matthew cites, adding, "Which being interpreted is, God with us."¹⁴ Nor did they know of what *person* Messiah should be born, until Gabriel appeared and himself declared unto "a virgin espoused to a man whose name was Joseph, of the house of David; and the virgin's name was *Mary*."¹⁵ "*Fear not, Mary, . . . thou shalt bring forth a Son, and thou shalt call his name JESUS*. He shall be great, and shall be called THE SON OF THE HIGHEST: and the Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David; and he shall reign over the house of Jacob forever; and of his kingdom there shall be no end."¹⁶ Nor did they know at what *place* Messiah should be born until the time of Micah: "But thou, Bethlehem Ephratha, though thou be little among the thousands of Judah, yet out of thee shall come forth unto me [One that is] to be the Ruler in Israel, whose goings forth have been from old, from everlasting."¹⁷

§ 14. Jewish Literature.

a) Jewish Talmud. Talmudic literature is replete with interesting references to Messianic expectations based upon Hebrew prophecy as taught by the ancient Rabbis respecting both the birth and the character of the "Coming One."

A. *Messiah's Birth*. The continuance of the world will

¹⁰ Rev. v, 5.
14; Matt. i, 22, 23.

¹¹ Ps. cxxxii, 11.
¹⁵ Luke i, 26, 27.

¹² Sam. vii, 13.
¹⁶ Luke i, 30-33.

¹³ Zech. xiii, 1.
¹⁷ Mic. v, 2; Matt. ii, 6.

¹⁴ Isa. vii,

be for "a week of heavenly days;" "two thousand years of confusion; two thousand years under the Law; and two thousand are the days of the Messiah."¹⁸ "After the two thousand years of the Law, according to the decree, Messiah ought to come." According to this calculation, it was exactly at the close of the period when "the fullness of time was come," that Messiah did appear in the birth and person of Jesus Christ. "He came unto his own [nation] but his own received him not."¹⁹ Rabbi Frey says that now many of the most distinguished Rabbis agree with the famous Rab, that the time is long past from every viewpoint, according to the Hebrew Scriptures, when Messiah must have come, and we must look into the past to identify him. The Rabbis say, "The right time for Messiah's advent is passed, and he is now believed to have been born." "For the Messiah is born; his name is *Mënächem* [*Comforter*]." "Messiah was born at the royal residence of Bethlehem in Judæa," In the Talmudic book called "Generations," it is said: "*Jesus of Nazareth was born . . . under the Emperor Augustus*; and at the same time there lived [at Jerusalem] Rabbi Simeon ben Hillel and Jochanan ben Zacha. *From this time begin the years of the Nazarene*," or the Christian era.

B. *His Incarnation.* Founded upon Isaiah's prediction of the Messiah's virgin mother, the Rabbis record that Messiah was born of a virgin, with the added emphasis that "He should be without an earthly father," because he should not be the progeny of any man, but should be "the seed of the woman;" and appearing in the order of Melchizedek, he would come into the world without an ancestry, and leave the world without a posterity. This proposition is substantially conveyed by ancient Rabbis in different forms of expression as follows: *

1. "Come see the way of the blessed God is not like that of flesh and blood. For the Lord hath created a new thing: a woman shall

* For references to the Jewish Talmud and the Scriptural bases, see Rabbi Frey's *Messiahship of Jesus*, pp. 125, 126, 137.

¹⁸ Edzard, 66; Schöttgen, ii, 963.

¹⁹ John i. 11.

- compass a Man." Jer. xxxi, 22. "*This is the King Messiah of whom it is written: Thou art my Son: this day have I begotten thee.*" (Psa. 11, 7.)
2. "This is that seed which shall arise from a different place. . . . *It is the King Messiah.*"
 3. "The Man whose name is Branch shall grow out of his place by a different principle of generation." (Isa. xi, 1; Jer. xxiii, 5, 6.)
 4. "The Redeemer whom I will raise up among you, shall not have a father, according to Zechariah" (vi, 12, 13).
 5. "The birth of the Messiah alone shall not be like that of any other creatures in the world;" but is an Incarnation.
 6. "The birth of the Messiah alone shall be without defect;" that is, sinless.
 7. "The birth of the Messiah shall be like the dew from the Lord, as drops upon the grass expect not the labor of man."
 8. "None shall know his Father until he tells it." (John vii, 27; ix, 29.)
 9. "The King Messiah shall be revealed in the land of Galilee." (John ii, 1-11; Luke iv, 14-22.)

These rabbinical references descriptive of the Messiah's Nativity are peculiarly Jewish conceptions and expression. The *Incarnation of the Messiah is the central thought*. They not only apply to Jesus of Nazareth, but to no others; and they accentuate his identity with the Messiahship both in character and fact. The revelation of the Messianic character and person, and his relation as Prophet, Priest, and King, came through Hebrew prophets.²⁰ But the realization of his coming and ruling, his power and glory, was by no means restricted to the Hebrew people and commonwealth. They were the medium for the communication of the great fact and interests involved applying to the whole human race. Nevertheless, Israel failed of the great apprehension, and misinterpreted that which was wholly spiritual, as being wholly secular and restorative of the Hebrew nation from the oppressions of the Romans, to their ancient kingdom and splendor.²¹

β) Chaldaic Targum. These writings illustrate and evidence what the traditional teachings had been previously to the Nativity of Jesus, as well as the contemporary view enter-

²⁰ Psa. ii, xi, cx; Isa. ii, xi, liii.

²¹ Acts i, 6; Luke xxii, 24-30; xxiv, 21; Mark xi, 10.

tained respecting the Messiah's coming. The *written* paraphrases belong to the first half of the first Christian century.

A. The Targum of *Onkelos* is very restricted and exact in expression, but being limited to the Pentateuch, the Messianic references are necessarily scanty.

α) *Shiloh*. "Till Shiloh come:" "Till Messiah comes, whose is the kingdom, and to whom is the gathering of the nations."²²

β) *Balaam*. "A king shall arise from Jacob, and a Messiah shall be anointed from Israel."²³

B. Targum of *Jonathan* covering the Prophets, makes frequent reference to Messiah, and the references are accordant with later teachings.

γ) *A King*. "A King shall come forth from the sons of Jesse, and Messiah shall arise from his sons' sons. This is the Branch of the Lord, the son given to the house of David, who shall endure forever, in whose time shall be much peace."²⁴

δ) *Descent*. Messiah is David's Son, who "shall go forth from them, and be revealed from the midst of them, and teach them the worship of the Lord, as the mystical Shepherd to whom the flock should be restored, in whom all the just should trust, and all the humble dwell under the shadow of His kingdom."²⁵

ε) *Redeemer*. "Because God hath cleansed their souls from sins, they shall see the kingdom of their Messiah, they shall have many sons and daughters, they shall prolong their days, and keeping the Law of the Lord they shall be happy according to His good pleasure."

γ) Jewish People. As already seen there were fragments and aspects related to the Messianic personality and character scattered along through the Old Testament which the apostles have gathered up and framed into a living portrait of the Christ of God. The Gospels exhibit how widespread was the understanding with the people, and how keen was their anticipation of his advent, at the time of Christ's coming. He is especially referred to as a *Prophet* in a pre-eminent sense, as the Son of David, as the Messiah of Scripture, as the Son of God. These terms were all designations of the Messianic Person: and they are all applied to Jesus Christ. John by

²² Gen. xlix, 10.

²³ Num. xxiv, 17.

²⁴ Isa. xl, 1; iv. 2; Jer. xxiii, 5; xxxiii, 15; Isa. ix, 6.

²⁵ Hos. iii, 5; Jer. xxx, 9; xxxiii, 13-15; Ezek. xvii, 23.

his preaching intensified the people's sense of apprehension on this subject. When multitudes thronged to his baptism, some questioned whether he himself was not the Messiah. They said:

"Who art thou? And he confessed, and denied not, but confessed, I am not the Christ." "Ye yourselves bear me witness that I said, I am not the Christ, but that I am sent before Him."²⁶ "What then, art thou Elijah? And he saith, I am not. *Art thou that Prophet?* and he answered, No."²⁷ The Pharisees asked the blind-born: "What sayest thou of him in that he opened thine eyes? And he said, He is a Prophet."²⁸ When Cleopas and another disciple knew not Jesus on the day of his rising, they related to him the crucifixion, "Concerning Jesus of Nazareth, who was a Prophet, mighty in deed and word before God and all the people. . . . But we trusted that it had been he which should have redeemed Israel."²⁹ When, on the last and great day of the feast Jesus at the temple addressed the people, some of the multitude, when they heard his words, said: "This is of a truth *the Prophet*: others said, *This is the Christ*. But some said, What, doth the Christ come out of Galilee? Hath not the Scripture said that the Christ cometh of the seed of David, and from Bethlehem, the village where David was?"³⁰ Peter said to the people: "And it shall be that every soul which will not hearken to that Prophet, shall be utterly destroyed from among the people. Yea, and all the prophets from Samuel, and them that followed after, as many as have spoken, they also told of these days."³¹

Nevertheless, the people's hope had been much secularized by rabbinical teachings. Even the disciples were expecting Christ to come and establish an earthly kingdom, in which some of them were ambitious to occupy places of honor. Yet twice at least directly, and oftener by indirection, did the disciples identify and call Jesus "Messiah."

"Andrew first findeth his own brother Simon, and saith unto him, We have found the Messiah, which is being interpreted the Christ."³² "Philip findeth Nathanael and saith unto him, We have found him of whom Moses in the Law and the Prophets did write, Jesus of Nazareth, the son of Joseph."³³ Nathanael approaching Jesus said, "Rabbi, thou art the Son of God: thou art King of Israel."³⁴

At Cæsarea-on-the-Sea, Paul said unto King Agrippa II:

"And now I stand and am judged for the hope of the promise made of God unto our fathers; unto which promise our twelve tribes, instantly

²⁶ Luke iii, 16; John i, 20; iii, 28.

²⁷ John i, 21.

²⁸ John ix, 17.

²⁹ Luke xxiv, 19, 21.

³⁰ John vii, 40, 41, 42.

³¹ Acts iii, 23, 24.

³² John i, 41.

³³ *Ib.* i, 45.

³⁴ *Ib.* i, 49.

serving God day and night, hope to come.”³⁵ With “the just and devout Simeon,” many were “waiting for the Consolation of Israel;” “and it was revealed unto him that he should not see death before that he had seen the Lord’s Christ.” And taking the child up in his arms, he said: “Now lettest thou thy servant depart in peace, O Lord, according to thy word; for mine eyes have seen thy salvation which thou hast prepared before the face of all peoples; a light for revelation to the Gentiles, and the glory of thy people Israel.”³⁶

These instances indicate how widespread and constant was the anticipation of “the Coming One” among the Jewish people, but also illustrate their identification of the Messianic Person. Nevertheless, there remained doubts with some respecting where Messiah should be born, and hence questioning about his identity. Some of Jerusalem said:

“Do the rulers know indeed that this is the very Christ? Howbeit we know this man whence he is; but when Christ cometh, no man knoweth whence He is.”³⁷ “Many of the people . . . said, Of a truth this is the Prophet. Others said, This is the Christ. But some said, Shall Christ come out of Galilee? Hath not the Scripture said, That Christ cometh of the seed of David, and out of the town of Bethlehem where David was? So there was a division among the people because of him.”³⁸ At Capernaum they said: “Is not this Jesus the son of Joseph, whose father and mother we know? How is it then that he saith, I came down from heaven?”³⁹ The Pharisees said unto Nicodemus: “Art thou also of Galilee? Search and look; for out of Galilee ariseth no Prophet.”⁴⁰ When Jesus wrought miracles upon the dumb, the blind, and the possessed, “All the people were amazed, and said: Is not this the Son of David?”⁴¹ Two blind men followed him and cried: “Thou Son of David, have mercy on us.”⁴² Jesus himself said to the Pharisees, “What think ye of Christ? Whose Son is He? They say unto him, The Son of David. He saith unto them, How then doth David in the Spirit call him Lord? . . . If David then call him Lord, how is he his Son? And no man was able to answer him a word, neither durst any man ask him any more questions.”⁴³ And in his last and triumphal march to Jerusalem, the people shouted: “Hosanna to the Son of David:” “Blessed be the kingdom of our father David that cometh in the name of the Lord.”⁴⁴

§ 15. Other Nations.

a) *Wise Men.* Even the Magi, who had traversed stream and mountain and desert from the distant East, came to Jeru-

³⁵ Acts xxvi, 6, 7.

³⁶ Luke ii, 25, 26, 28-32.

³⁷ John vii, 26, 27.

³⁸ *Ib.* vii, 41, 42.

³⁹ *Ib.* vi, 42.

⁴⁰ *Ib.* vii, 52.

⁴¹ Matt. xxi, 9; Mark xi, 10; Luke xix, 38.

⁴² *Ib.* ix, 27; xx, 30.

⁴³ *Ib.* xxii, 41-46.

⁴⁴ Matt. xxi, 9; Mark xi, 10; Luke xix, 38.

salem, saying: "Where is he that is born King of the Jews, for we have seen his star in the east, and have come to worship him."⁴⁵

β) *Canaanite*. The woman of Canaan understood the situation when she cried out after Jesus: "Have mercy on me, O Lord, thou Son of David: my daughter is grievously vexed with a devil."⁴⁶

γ) *Samaritans*. The Samaritan woman at the well said to Jesus: "I know that Messias cometh who is called Christ: when He is come, he will declare all things unto us. Jesus saith unto her: *I that speak unto thee am he.*" She reported to the men of the city: "Come, see a man who told me all things that ever I did; can this be the Christ?" And from that city "many Samaritans believed on him because of the word of the woman who testified, He told me all things that ever I did. . . . And many more believed because of his word; and they said unto the woman: Now we believe, not because of thy speaking; for we have heard him ourselves, *and know that this is indeed the Savior of the World.*"⁴⁷

In ascertaining how deep and widespread was the persuasion of men of the coming of the Messiah, the Scriptures have been cited in illustration, the same as any other literature. This is legitimate since the Scriptures are the only source from which we derive the Messianic idea; and these writings are indispensable in learning what the Messianic idea was. They published abroad among the family of nations the advent of One who should be known as "*the Prince of Peace,*"⁴⁸ whose coming would introduce, in the spiritual and supreme sense, *the Golden Age of the world*. Prophecy had distinctly declared that "The Desire of Nations shall come;"⁴⁹ and "the isles shall wait for his Law:"⁵⁰ "and on his name shall the Gentiles hope,"⁵¹ whose dominion shall be "an everlasting dominion which shall not pass away, and his kingdom that which shall

⁴⁵ Matt. 11, 2.

⁴⁶ *Ib.* xv, 22.

⁴⁷ John iv, 25, 26, 29, 39, 41, 42.

⁴⁸ Isa. ix, 6.

⁴⁹ Hag. 11, 7. ⁵⁰ Isa. xlii, 4. ⁵¹ καὶ ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ ἔθνη ἐλπιοῦσιν, Matt. xii, 21.

not be destroyed.”⁵² As “the fullness of time”⁵³ was at hand, the conviction deepened as it was already widespread, in waiting expectancy of Messiah’s advent, due probably to the trust and activity of the Jews of the Dispersion, who in all lands abroad had been teaching the Greek Scriptures of the Septuagint. As remarked by a learned writer :

“By their dispersion among so many nations, by their conversations with the learned men among the heathen, and the [Jews’] translation [the Septuagint] of their inspired writings into a language almost universal, the principles of their religion were spread all over the East; and it became the common belief that a Prince would arise at that time in Judæa, and would change the face of the world, and extend his empire from one end of the earth to the other.”⁵⁴

Meantime, Jesus of Nazareth was born in Bethlehem of Judæa, exactly accordant with every predicted circumstance mentioned in the ancient Scriptures. He lived his life; he wrought his works; he completed his ministry; he fulfilled the Messianic hope; he claimed the Messianic character as the Christ of Scripture. But in one particular he disappointed Jewish expectation grievously. He refused absolutely to become monarch of the Jewish commonwealth. Before the people and before Pilate, he rejected all claims to a temporal kingship. “When Jesus therefore perceived that they would come and take him by force, and make him a king, he withdrew again into a mountain, himself alone.”⁵⁵ And when the Roman procurator asked him pointedly, “Art thou the king of the Jews? . . . Jesus answered, My kingdom is not of this world.”⁵⁶ This was an absolute repudiation of an earthly kingdom. He would not deliver the Jews from the Roman yoke. Therefore they ignored his Messianic claims; they rejected his divine character; they crucified his person; and ever since, in order to vindicate their own prophetic Scriptures, they have had recourse to some heathen ruler as the “Chosen One,” who, so far from delivering them from the

⁵² Dan. vii, 14.

⁵³ Gal. iv. 4; Eph. 1, 10.

⁵⁵ John vi, 15.

⁵⁴ Dr. Henderson Buck in the *Encl.*

⁵⁶ John xviii, 33, 36.

Relig. Knowl., 1859, p. 859.

oppressive Romans, one actually came at the head of the Roman army and utterly destroyed their nation.

About thirty-five years after the crucifixion, Vespasian, a Roman general of distinction, with the imperial army invaded Palestine for the express purpose of subjugating the rebellious Jews. At the headquarters the news was received that the Emperor of Rome was dead. Thereupon the soldiery immediately proclaimed Vespasian emperor. Accordingly, Vespasian turned over his large and powerful command to his son Titus, who accompanied him in this campaign, while he himself went to the imperial capital to assume the purple and prerogatives of the throne. This circumstance explains the testimonies now to be introduced.

§ 16. Testimony of Adversaries.

a) *Vergil*. It has already been seen how this poet anticipated that "the last age had come" when a new era would begin; "*a Holy Progeny from heaven descends, auspicious in his birth,*" who should introduce "*the Golden Age, most glorious to behold.*"⁵⁷

β) *Josephus*. "That which did especially inspire them [the Jews] to undertake this war was an ambiguous oracle found likewise in their Sacred Writings, how that *some one of their own country, pertaining to that time, should attain the empire of the habitable earth.* The Jews took this prediction to belong to themselves in particular, and many of their wise men were deceived thereby in their judgment." After this testimony, he adds his opinion: "Now this oracle certainly denoted the government of Vespasian, who was appointed emperor [while he was yet] in Judæa."⁵⁸

γ) *Suetonius*. "A firm persuasion had long prevailed through all the East, that it was fated [*i. e.*, contained in the Book of Fates or Prophecies] *at that time*, to devolve on some one who should come forth from Judæa. This prediction referred to the Roman emperor [Vespasian] as the event proved; but the Jews, applying it to themselves, engaged in rebellion."⁵⁹

δ) *Tacitus*. Speaking of the prodigies which occurred prior to the destruction of Jerusalem, he says: "A few turned these events into a cause for alarm; the greater number were possessed with a belief that

⁵⁷ *Eclage* iv; cf. *Ovid*, i, 89, and *Eusebius*, *Præparationis Evangelicæ*, Lib. i, 7; xii, 13.

⁵⁸ ὡς κατὰ τὸν καιρὸν ἐκείνον ἀπὸ τῆς χώρας τις ἀνθρώπων, Wars VI, 5, § 4.

⁵⁹ "Precrebuerat Oriente toto, vetus et constans opinio, esse in fatis *ut eo tempore*, Judæa profecti rerum potirentur. Id, de Imperatore Romano, quantum eventu postea predictum paruit, Judaæ ad se trahentes, rebellarunt." *Vespas*. 4.

it was written in the ancient writings of the priests that it would come to pass *at that very time*, that the East would grow mighty, and that men proceeding from Judæa would gain the empire of the world—an ambiguous oracle which had foretold [the fortunes of] Vespasian and Titus.”⁶⁰

e) *Celsus*. Representing himself as being a Jew, he says: “The prophets declare Him coming to be great, the Potentate of all the earth, Lord of the nations and armies.” “How should we, having made known to all mankind that there is to come from God One punishing the wicked, dishonor him having come?”⁶¹

CRITICAL CONSIDERATIONS.

There was a widespread conviction among the nations of a Golden Age to come; that it would be marked by the advent of a Personage descended from heaven who would become the Ruler of the world; that this expectation was of long continuance, whose realization was related to a definite period,—are so many facts affirmed absolutely by the several writers cited. Of the five writers quoted, one was a Latin poet, one was an eclectic philosopher, and three were historians, of whom one was a Jewish priest, and two were Roman authors of fame. Not one of the five can be said to have been friendly to Christ or his cause. Nevertheless, the ideas of every one on this subject were evidently derived from the Scriptures, as is obvious from the reference to “the Book of Fates,” which is the heathen designation of the Hebrew prophets kept in the custody of the priests. They agree on the main facts, but differ on the details. The Jews themselves, unto whom the facts predicted were given by Divine revelations, and in whose special interests they were to have realization, were instructed from the first to understand that the application of this prophecy was absolutely and exclusively to be made to Messiah, who was the burden of these Sacred Writings; and that when he should appear, these predictions should find definite and complete verification in his

⁶⁰ Hist. v, 13: “Pluribus persuasio inerat, antiquis sacerdotum literis contineri eo ipso tempore fore, ut valesceret Oriens, profectique Judæa rerum potirentur. Quae ambages Vespasianum ac Titum prædixerant.” Westcott’s transl. *Intro. to Gospels*, 152.

⁶¹ *Origen contra Celsum*, Lib. 11, c. 29; ii, 8.

history. This circumstance is of paramount importance in determining the right interpretation of the facts involved; for while the demands of the predictive text have never been applicable to any other man in history than Jesus Christ, his case fails in no particular of being the intended realization. But at the time of his advent, the teachers taught that Messiah would appear as a political Deliverer, who would rescue them from Roman domination, and give them back their temporal kingdom with all its ancient glory. They overlooked the fact that their lawgiver would depart from his place when Shiloh should come. In Jewish apprehension, with notable exceptions, there was a missing of the true sense and grandeur of Christ's character and identity. *Certainly no one ever arose to give the Jewish nation deliverance from the Romans. Upon the contrary, the Romans destroyed the Jewish nation, burned down their temple, and abolished their whole system of religious ceremony. Historically, they are to-day as they have been for nearly two thousand years, without a nationality, without a theocracy, without a temple, without a sacrifice, without a priest, and without a Messiah!**

It is the peculiarity of the attesting witnesses that, in interpreting the predictive fact, they mention the expression of "the oracle" as being both "mysterious" and "ambiguous," as seemingly best suited to their wishes. It is obviously scant ground to rest a conclusion upon, that because Vespasian, who, at the head of the Roman army, came as an invader of the Jews' land and nation, having entered upon the country, was called thence to the imperial throne, he met all the demands of the predicted Messiah. Josephus is explicit in saying that "ONE of their own country" (of the Jews), *not two foreigners from Italy*, as Tacitus asserts, "should become the Ruler of the habitable earth." Vespasian was no Jew; he did not arise in the Jews' country, but was a Roman and belonged to Rome. The Jews

§ 18. The
Person
Predicted.

* See Hosea iii, 4.

expected their Messiah to come as "the Prince of Peace," but Vespasian came as a man of war. The Jews expected that Messiah would establish for them an independent monarchy; whereas Vespasian took from them the last of their ancient kingdom and glory. The Jews had hoped to acquire an undivided possession of their own land; but Vespasian expatriated all the people from their native Palestine. The Jews were expected to occupy a position in which they could dominate the Gentile nations about them; but Vespasian devastated their country and reduced their people to a condition of absolute slavery. The Jews expected a Messianic deliverance from Roman power, bringing untold prosperity and happiness to their nation; but Vespasian brought them "tribulation, such as there hath not been the like from the beginning of the creation which God had created until now, and never shall be."⁶² Dr. Philip Schaff has aptly remarked:

"Tacitus and Suetonius speak of a widespread expectation of that kind, at the time of the Jewish war and before, but falsely refer it to the Roman emperors Vespasian and Titus. In this the heathen historians follow Josephus, who well knew and believed the Messianic hopes of his people, and yet was not ashamed basely to betray and pervert them."⁶³

In critical investigation, it is indispensable to difference that which is *fact* from that which is the mere *opinion* of the witness respecting the fact; between the *revealed* Messianic anticipation, and the perverted *interpretation* applied to it. Opinion is not evidence. However sincerely a historian may entertain a speculative conclusion, it is not evidential. Mere sincerity can not stand for history. Facts are the canon of truth and sound reasoning on historical questions. The Messianic fact, however, is secure and can not be destroyed by misapprehension or perversion or misapplication. If it should be said that the claims of Jesus to the Messiahship are rendered uncertain from the circumstance that

⁶² Mark xiii, 19; Matt. xxiv, 21. ⁶³ *Hist. Christ. Church*, Vol. I, p. 114, Note 1.

“false Christs” have arisen, as in the case of Bar-Kocheba,⁶⁴ in the reign of Hadrian, in which thousands of Jewish adherents lost their lives, the sufficient reply is, that no number of false Christs proves that a true Christ never existed. If there were no original, there would be no imitation; if there were no genuine coin issued, there would be no reason for spurious coin to exist. False evidence can not disprove the truth.

Unquestionably even the disciples of Jesus until the Pentecost were misled by their unspiritual preconceptions of what Messiah’s kingdom and reign were to be. They obviously believed that the Son and successor of David meant literally David’s royalty and realm. As the disciples accompanied the Master to the Mount of Ascension, they asked him: “Lord, wilt thou at this time restore again the kingdom of Israel?”⁶⁵ But from the day when the “demonstration of the Spirit and of the power” came upon them, they stood upon a higher plane, and had a realizing sense of Christ’s saying before Pilate, “My kingdom is not of this world.”⁶⁶

There is some discrepancy between Josephus and the Roman historians respecting *the date* when the Messianic prediction of Haggai should find its fulfillment. Tacitus and Suetonius are much more definite as to the exact point of time contemplated by this prophecy. The Roman writers refer the realization to the year 69, when Vespasian was invading Palestine, but was recalled to assume the rule of the empire, instead of the year of Christ’s Nativity which occurred about B. C. 4. Suetonius says definitely “*at that time*,”⁶⁷ meaning the time when Vespasian received the imperial crown. He declares that the anticipation was “an old and unvarying expectation” abroad among the nations. Tacitus is even more emphatic in dating the occurrence “*at that very time*,”⁶⁸ referring also to the occasion when Vespasian assumed the imperial purple and power. But Josephus, on whose authority both relied, says merely, “*During that time*,” as a

⁶⁴ A. D. 132-135.

⁶⁵ Acts 1, 6.

⁶⁶ John xviii, 36.

⁶⁷ *Eo tempore*.

⁶⁸ *Eo ipso tempore*.

period, "One from their own country [*Palæstine*] should obtain the empire of the habitable earth."⁶⁹ Long after the Jews's nationality had been destroyed, with the persistency characteristic of that people, did they carry forward their cherished hope of a Messiah who would become the Governor of their restored nation. But many of their most learned and judicious Rabbis are now, not looking into the future for their King, but into the past; and some have found him in the MAN OF NAZARETH.

Quite a number of claimants have arisen in the past ages for the place and honors of Messiah. But they brought with them none of the Christly credentials. Each one in turn has been relegated to the list of impostors. Only One ever absolutely met the demands of the predictive text. If Jesus Christ was not the realization of Messianic prophecy, there never was, and there never will be, a Messiah-Savior. There never was, and there never can be, but *the one time for his coming*. *All conditions were present when Jesus came; and all characteristics centered in his person*. No human being as he ever so impressed himself upon the consciousness of the world, and made that impression imperishable! For nearly two thousand years the crucified One has lived in the hearts of myriads of human beings. There never was, there never will be, but one Christ. Who else could occupy his place in history? As was beautifully expressed by Jean Paul Richter, "The life of Christ concerns him who, being the holiest of the mighty and the mightiest of the holy, lifted, with his pierced hands, empires off their hinges, and turned the stream of centuries out of its channel, and still governs the Ages."

§ 21. The
Christ.

⁶⁹ In the Greek text, Josephus employs the accusative case to express *continuance of time, as during a considerable period within which the event occurred*, rather than the use of the dative case, which would have conveyed the idea of a definite point of time when the expected Messiah should come. Scholars will observe the force of the preposition in connection with the accusative case: *κατὰ τὸν καιρὸν ἐκείνον*—*down along, or, during that period*. The testimony of Josephus, then, is to this effect: "Some one from their own country during that period of time should attain the empire of the habitable earth."

CHAPTER II.

NATIVITY OF JESUS CHRIST.

- I. THE FOUR GOSPELS: THEIR OBJECTS, CHARACTER, AND CONTENTS.
- II. THE VALUE OF MERE OPINIONS: NOT EVIDENTIAL AS TESTIMONY.
- III. THE AFFIRMATIONS OF ADVERSARIES RESPECTING CHRIST'S NATIVITY.
 - α) *The Witness of the Jewish Talmud.*
 - β) *The Witness of the Toledoth Jeshu.*
 - γ) *The Witness of the Literary Champion, Celsus.*
 - δ) *The Witness of the Emperor, Julian the Apostate.*
- IV. THE CONFIRMATION OF ADVERSARIES BY CHRISTIAN WRITERS.
 - α) *Witness of Ignatius, A. D. 110.*
 - β) *Witness of Tertullian, A. D. 200.*
 - γ) *Witness of the Apostle Paul, A. D. 56-58.*
- V. INDUCTIONS WARRANTED BY THE FACTS EVIDENCED.
Analysis, Review and Summary of the Evidence.

CHAPTER II.

THE NATIVITY OF JESUS.

§ 22. Sources: Biographical Epitomes of Witnesses and Literature.

Those hostile to Christianity whose testimony is adduced in this chapter are Julian the Apostate, and the rabbinical authors of the Jewish Talmud, and the Toledoth Jeshu, or "History of Jesus." Those friendly to the faith are Origen, Ignatius, and Tertullian. Those of modern criticism are Tischendorf, Westcott, and Lardner.

1. JULIAN was born at Constantinople on November 6, 331 A. D., and died in June 26, 363, when in his thirty-second year. He ruled the Roman Empire conjointly about six years, but as sole emperor about eighteen months. History accords him eminence for genius, learning, and chastity of character. In his extreme ambition for fame he became openly hostile to Christianity. He renounced the Christian religion when about twenty years of age, but kept the fact secret from the army until after it had declared him to be sole emperor. Hence originated the dishonoring epithet ascribed to him, "the Apostate." His education had been nominally Christian under the direction of Eusebius, Bishop of Nicomedia. But the despotic rule in his education reacted in Julian's mind to that extent that he went over to dire paganism, and became as fanatical in his devotion to heathenism as he was a hater of the Christian religion.

"It can not be denied that Julian was a persecutor." (Lardner.) He proclaimed to the world that he would prove the prediction of Jesus false respecting the rebuilding of the Jews' temple at Jerusalem. The Savior had said, "Verily I say unto you, There shall not be left one stone upon another." (Matt. xxiv, 1, 2; Mark xiii, 2; Luke xix, 41-44; xxi, 5, 6.) Julian sent his personal friend Alypius to superintend the reconstruction of the temple at the expense of the imperial treasury, promising that if the Jews would return and assist in the work, on his return from the Persian expedition, he would be present at the dedication, and the Mosaic sacrifices would be resumed. This he did, not for any regard for Judaism, but from a spirit of hatred toward the Christian religion. But he never returned, and the temple was never rebuilt, and the Mosaic rites were never re-

sumed. He was mortally wounded in this campaign, and died in camp. He suppressed Christian schools, and meant to exterminate Christianity from the earth. The skeptical Gibbon says of Julian: "He affected to pity the unhappy Christians, . . . but his pity was degraded with contempt; his contempt was embittered with hatred; and the sentiments of Julian were expressed in a style of sarcastic wit which inflicted deep and deadly wounds, wherever it issues from the mouth of a sovereign." (*Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, c. xxiii, Amer. ed.) His profound estrangement is illustrated in several Letters while at Antioch, Syria, which was then the center of Christianity for the Gentiles. These Letters were directed against the Antiochian Christians, as were also his works entitled *The Cæsars*, *Misopogon*, a satirical writing; but with a more general purpose he designated his famous book entitled *Karà Xριστιανῶν*, *Against the Christians*. By reason of a mistaken zeal this work was destroyed by Theodosius II, mere fragments having been preserved in Cyril's refutation of Julian's writing.

2. THE TALMUD:*

1. *On Mary and the Nativity of Jesus*: See tract *Avoda Zara*, folio 16, b; *Sanhedrin* f. 67, a; *Kalla* 18, b. of Babylonian Talmud; also *Nederim* 48, a; *Kethuboth* 12, a; *Seder Hadoros*, p. 119; *Zamach David*, c. ii, p. 84.

2. *On Christ's residence in Egypt*: Bab. Tal. *Sanhedr.* 7, a, b; fol. 107, b. See Heb. *Talmudic Exercitations*, pp. 111, 112.

3. *On the Miracles of Jesus* (explained as "Magical Arts" or "Sorcery"): Bab. Tal. *Shabbath* fol. 104, b; 107, b. *Jerusalem Talmud*, *Shabbath* fol. 13, 1; f. 4, 2.

4. *On the Crucifixion of Jesus*: Bab. Tal. *Sanhedr.* 43, a; 67, a, and 107, b.

5. *On the Disciples of Jesus*: Bab. Tal. *Sanhedrin*, 43, a. fin; *Avoda Zara* f. 16, b.

6. *On the Disciples' Miracles*: Jerus. Talmud, *Shabbath* fol. 14, 4; one by James: *Avoda Zara*, 40, 4; fol. 16, 2; 27, 2.

7. *On the Destruction of Jerusalem*: Bab. Tal. *Gittin*, *Hanniskin*, fol. 56, a.

3. TOLEDOTH JESHU † (*i. e.*, *History or Generation of Jesus*) is a rabbinical work of very ancient but unknown date. It is understood to have been taken from the Talmud, and was expressly written against Christ and Christianity. It purports to give an account from the Jews' standpoint of the birth, character, and the death of Jesus of Nazareth. Some years ago an English translation was made of

* See general description of this work before chapter 1, pp. 1 and 2.

† תולדות ישו The ישו is a contraction of יהושע, originally, יהושע, Joshua=Jesus.

this work in two volumes in England, under the title *The Gospel According to the Jews*. It contains some vile and wretched stories which the Jews put in circulation soon after the crucifixion, to prevent a belief in his resurrection, and therefore in Christianity.* This opprobrious work contains also important testimony relating to the Nativity of Jesus, His Childhood, His Teachings, His Miracles, His Royalty, His Passion and Death, His Burial, and His Twelve Disciples. The work is bitter in spirit and is obviously based upon the Jewish Talmud. For citations of this work see *Excursus G*, VII, at the close.

4. ORIGEN of Alexandria (b. 185 A. D., d. 254) was celebrated alike for his genius, his scholarship, and his extraordinary influence over men. His father was named Leonidas, and was a rhetorician of high standing, who helped to educate Origen. He pursued his studies in the Catechetical School under the famous Clement of Alexandria. At eighteen, Origen became the head and successor of Clement, who fled from persecution to Palestine. He diligently studied philosophy under the chief masters of the several schools, and the different heresies which sprang up in the Christian Church. He also traveled extensively in Arabia, Palestine, Greece, and Italy. He attained to eminence so rapidly that the principal men from abroad sought his counsel in many respects. Both heathen and heretics of much distinction were won over to Christianity in its true faith. A Gnostic of wealth named Ambrosius became his liberal patron, and supplied him with an invaluable library and with a corps of stenographers to report his daily lectures, and another corps of copyists to engross the work. An Arabian prince visited Origen to learn from him the mysterious power of his life and religion. Julia Mammæa, the mother of Alexander Severus (who reigned A. D. 222-235) induced him to come to Antioch in Syria, that she might learn the character of his new and strange doctrines.

However, Bishop Demetrius, who had nominated Origen for the headship of the Theological School at Alexandria, in which he had served with conspicuous ability and success, partly from motives of envy, but ostensibly on the ground of false doctrines according to the bishop's view, used all the influence of his office and person to have Origen excommunicated from the Church in Egypt. But this was utterly without justification. The Church in Arabia, in Palestine, in Achaïa and Phœnicia, refused to concur in that decision. Thereupon Origen manfully resigned his charge and position in the school as its principal, and, leaving the country, went to his former teacher and patron in Palestine—

*See Justin Martyr's *Dialogue with the Jew Trypho*, c. xvii, and cviii in the *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, Vol. I, pp. 303, 253.

to Clement. Under his counsel and direction, Origen opened and organized another school in Cæsarea, which soon became even more famous than the one he had left in Alexandria. A former pupil of Origen, named Dionysius, soon became Bishop of Alexandria, and was careful to invite Origen to return. He did so; but the Decian persecution having set in, Origen was arrested, imprisoned, and was subjected to torture by the Roman Government for his faith, and was condemned to die as a martyr. The death of the Emperor Decius (251) effected his release. But having been loaded with a heavy chain, his constitution broken by torture, and his body maimed, he died soon after in the sixty-ninth year of his age.

Jerome (A. D. 331-420) regarded Origen as the greatest Doctor who had risen in the Church since the apostles. His learning embraced all parts and departments of learning, philology, philosophy, and theology. With such a powerful memory he combined remarkable penetration and wide comprehensiveness of intellect, with a glowing imagination and power of expression. His commentaries are a wealth of learning and suggestiveness. His famous refutation of the literary champion of opposition, named Celsus, in eight books, is a masterpiece. It is entitled *Origen contra Celsum*, and may be found translated in the *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, Vol. IV.

5. IGNATIUS (d. 107) assumed the name Theophorus, "*Bearer of God*," having reference to the indwelling Christ. He has been called the "latest and greatest of the Apostolic Fathers." He was elected Bishop of Antioch, Syria, about seventy-four years after Christ's ascension. Eusebius and Jerome place him as the second bishop after Peter, Euodius being the first. Roman traditions represent him variously as the disciple of Paul, of Peter, and of the apostle John. He was certainly the contemporary of the apostles, and Chrysostom is careful to say that Ignatius "conversed familiarly with them, and was perfectly familiar with their doctrines," and apostolic hands were laid on his head when Ignatius was consecrated to the episcopate. There is withal a pleasing but unhistorical story that Ignatius was identical with the child whom Jesus took up in his arms and blessed, when he said, "Of such is the kingdom of heaven." (Mark x, 16.)

Ignatius having been sentenced to death for the crime of being a Christian, he was hurried off to Rome, where he was cast into the Coliseum to the wild beasts. A prisoner in chains on the way thither afoot, he was subjected to much rudeness and insult of the guard who conducted him to the capital. At Smyrna he met Polycarp, a fellow bishop, and he addressed his several letters to the Ephesians, the Magnesians, the Trallians, and the

Romans. At Troas there was a brief halt in the journey, where he wrote three additional epistles to the Philadelphians, to the Smyrneans, and a personal letter to Polycarp. All these are extant. Thence he passed to Neapolis through Macedonia, and thence across the Adriatic Sea, and then over the old Roman road to Rome. The date of his death is somewhat uncertain. If it occurred in A. D. 107 according to the common consensus, it was the same year as that in which Simeon, Bishop of Jerusalem, the successor of James, our Lord's brother, was martyred.

6. **TERTULLIAN** (150-220 or 240) was a Carthaginian and an eminent apologist of Christianity. He was born in the city of Carthage, the capital of Africa, the ancient rival of Rome. His father was a Roman centurion in the army, serving under the proconsular government. He is supposed to have lived to a good age and died a natural death; but nothing is really known on the subject.

Tertullian was liberally educated in Græco-Roman literature, and was learned in the law as a jurisconsult. His mind was well stored with history, philosophy, law, poetry, and eloquence. His writings bear evidence that he was well skilled in juridical lore, and knew well how to state the claims of the Christians in their defense before the highest authorities of the State. He understood well the doctrines of Christianity. He is called "the Father of Latin Theology, and one of the greatest men of antiquity." (Schaff.) The late M. Ernest Rénan regarded Tertullian as "a literary phenomenon," if not indeed a prodigy. His translator, Holmes, mentions his style as "terse and vigorous expression of terse and vigorous thought." The late Cardinal Newman regarded him as "the most powerful writer of the early centuries." He was a man of profound convictions and fearless courage. Schaff says: "For his opponents, be they heathen or Jews, heretics or Catholics, he has as little indulgence and regard as Luther. With the adroitness of a special pleader, he entangles them in self-contradictions, pursues them in every nook and corner, overwhelms them with arguments, sophisms, apothegms, and sarcasms, drives them before him with unmerciful lashings, and almost makes them ridiculous and contemptible. His polemics everywhere leave the marks of blood." (*Church Hist.*, II, 819, 823, 824.)

He flourished in the reign of Septimus Severus (193-211), and possibly in a part of the reign of Antoninus Caracalla (211-217). His *Apology* was a masterpiece, unexcelled in any literature. It was probably addressed, not to the emperor and Senate at Rome, but to the proconsul and chief magistrates of the African local government. For it is said that when the emperor visited Carthage and learned the facts of the Christian history under

persecutions, he disavowed the persecutions and offered a public apology for the inflictions of Plantinus, an unprincipled magistrate. (Coffin's *Ch. Fathers*, p. 264.)

THE MODERN CRITICS.

7. **TISCHENDORF** (1815–1874) was born in Lengenfeld, in Saxony, and was a student under the famous Hermann and Winer in the University of Leipsic. He was the receipt of a medal and many prizes in course. In 1837 the degree of Doctor of Philosophy was conferred upon him. In 1839–1841 he prepared a critical edition of the Greek New Testament; in 1840 he succeeded in doing what no man had ever done previously, cleaned a palimpsest manuscript by means of chemicals in Paris, restoring the original writing to distinctness. He did this in the case of the *Codex Ephraem Rescriptus* of the fifth century. As a recognition of his eminent abilities the University of Breslau thereupon bestowed upon him the honorary degree of Doctor of Theology. He visited the great libraries of Holland in 1841, and in 1842 those of England at Cambridge and Oxford, and spent more than 1843 in Italy. During the next year he repeated his visit to the East, spending ten months in Egypt, Palestine, and Sinai, and returned to Vienna and Munich. In 1853 he returned to these countries, visiting Sinai in 1859, when he discovered the famous *Codex Sinaiticus*, which he published in 1862. Returning, he was elected Professor of Paleography in the University of Leipsic, in consideration of his merits. Broken down by overwork, he died of apoplexy, on December 7, 1874.

It has been said of him that no theologian before him received so many marks of honorary distinction, both academic and civil. "He was made a Russian noble, a Saxon privy-councilor, a knight of many orders, a Doctor of all academic degrees. Unquestionably, Tischendorf was the foremost scholar in paleology of the age in the New Testament. As a Biblical critic he was equaled by few, and surpassed by none in modern times." His critical works number fourteen.

8. **BROOKE FOSS WESTCOTT** (b. 1828, d. 1901) was a graduate of Cambridge, England, bearing away high honors, with many medals and prizes in both classics and mathematics. He was made Canon of Peterborough Cathedral in 1869, Regius Professor of Divinity at Cambridge in 1870, honorary Chaplain to the Queen in April, 1875, and Bishop of Durham, 1890. His chief work is his *Canon of the New Testament during the first four centuries*, 5th ed., 1861. He was one of the English Company who revised the New Testament. He had no superior in his line of work.

9. NATHANIEL LARDNER (1684-1768) was educated at Utrecht and Londen, Holland. He was a profound scholar and a man of rare judgment, who devoted himself to a work to defend the Authenticity and Credibility of the New Testament. Some regard it as outranking Bishop Butler's *Analogy* in character for thoroughness. Certainly we are indebted to no man of his own time or since for such prolonged critical, exhaustive, and judicious discussion of the varied subjects involved as to Dr. Lardner. His works consist of ten volumes octavo, London, 1838, and constitute a perfect thesaurus of learning and critical care. In faith he was a Congregational Arian.

§ 23. The Nativity of Jesus Christ.

The life of Jesus has become the center of religious controversies which agitate our age. The importance of this fact is great. With the person of Jesus Christianity stands or falls.—TISCHENDORF.

The mode in which the different evangelists deal with the history of the incarnation and birth of our Lord offers a perfect illustration of their independence and special characteristics. Matthew and Luke combine to reveal as much of the great facts as help us to apprehend . . . the mode in which it was welcomed by those by whom God was pleased to work its accomplishment.—WESTCOTT.

Fear not to take unto thee Mary thy wife, for that which is begotten in her is OF THE HOLY SPIRIT. And she shall bring forth a Son, and thou shalt call His name JESUS.—ANGEL OF THE LORD.

The Word was GOD. AND THE WORD BECAME FLESH and dwelt among us, and we beheld His glory as of the only begotten from the Father, full of grace and truth.—JOHN.

When the fullness of time came, God sent forth his Son, born of a woman.—PAUL.

Εὐρήκαμεν τὸν Μεσσίαν (ὃ ἔστιν μεθερμηνεύμενον Χριστός). *We have found the Messiah, which is, being interpreted, CHRIST.*—ANDREW.

ARGUMENT.

Men's mere opinions have no authority whatsoever or evidential value in historical investigation. But concessions of fact and truth made by those in opposition are invaluable in reasoning, and preclude further argument. Moreover the denial of a supposed fact, of the past to the witness, indicates a conviction on the part of the opposition which existed prior to the denial, proving the historicity of the question so far; and the statement thereof logically

must be refuted by the denier on sound reasons, or the original affirmation being of long standing must be considered valid.

Enemies of Christianity attest the actuality of the birth of Jesus, declaring the event to be absolutely historical. They witness to the belief of the primitive Christians, that Jesus was truly begotten of the Holy Spirit, and born of the Virgin Mary, in the time of Quirinius. These testimonies are in exact accordance with the statements of the Gospels. As already seen, Talmudic literature concedes that the time for Messiah's advent has long since past, that it has actually occurred, on a "different principle of generation" from humanity, being born of "the seed of a woman," but without an earthly father. There is to be added now the witness of enemies to the lineage, the tribe, the time and place of birth of the only One who fulfilled all the predictions respecting the Messiahship, and who has impressed himself imperishably upon the consciousness of mankind for nearly two thousand years past.

The principal points now to be considered are:

1. What the Gospels affirm respecting the Nativity of Jesus Christ.
2. How far Adversaries confirm the Statements of the Evangelists.
3. The Incarnation a Subject not open to Historical Investigation.

Before there is anything to investigate, it must be ascertained precisely what the Gospels have affirmed relative to the Nativity of Jesus. In such inquiry the standpoint of each writer of the four Gospels should be taken, and the special object had in view by each writer should be clearly seen. What, then, are the main facts stated therein to be read and believed, touching the birth of Jesus Christ?

THE GOSPELS.

Matthew, being a Hebrew, first wrote his Gospel in the Hebrew language for the special advantage of the Hebrew people, employing that line of argument which would be most persuasive unto that nation. His main object was to prove by citations from prophecy that Jesus of Nazareth had fulfilled every Messianic prediction of the Scriptures, and that therefore he was the true Messiah. Hence, in his *genealogy* of our Lord, he traces the *royal descent from* Abraham the progenitor of the Jewish

§ 24. State-
ments of
the Gospels.

nation to prove that Jesus was a Jew, down *through the Davidic line of kings*, holding that he was the King of kings, and King "of the kingdom of heaven." Matthew affirms that "Jesus was born in Bethlehem of Judæa, in the days of Herod the king,"¹ in fulfillment of the Scripture. He then proceeds to mention a number of extraneous circumstances which group around the Nativity of Jesus, such as the appearance of a strange Star, the visit of the Wise Men, and the slaying of the male children by King Herod's order.

Luke, on the other hand, was a Greek, and wrote his Gospel in the Greek language, in the special interest of the Greek-speaking Gentiles, relating how that Gabriel had been sent by God from heaven "to a virgin betrothed to a man named Joseph, of the house of David, and the virgin's name was Mary."² He notes those circumstances which led up to the birth of Jesus, such as the Roman census or enrollment of the population under the direction of Quirinius, which was conducted in the strictest Jewish method, which required that each household should repair to its own tribal territory to be registered. This accounts for the fact that Joseph and Mary came to the territory of Judah and to Bethlehem, their ancestral village, for enrollment. Thence, with the instincts characteristic of an intelligent physician, Luke dwells more in detail than the other evangelists upon the physical aspects and incidents of the event; viz., the fulfillment of Mary's days, the bringing forth of her firstborn, wrapping the Child in swaddling clothes, and the circumstance, due probably less to the actual poverty of the family than to the crowded condition of the village, "that they laid him in a manger *because there was no room for him in the inn.*" He is also careful to mention that these things happened "in the days of Herod the king of Judæa."³ As Luke wrote for the Gentiles, he neglects the Messianic argument, which was of special interest only to the Jews, and, in his *genealogy* of Jesus, traces

¹ Matt. ii, 1. ² Luke i, 26, 27. ³ Luke i, 5; Comp. ii, 1-5.

his *natural descent* from Adam, the progenitor of the whole human race, cognizing Jesus as the *Redeemer of all mankind*.

Mark, who bears a Roman name, and had traveled extensively in the Roman Empire, wrote at Rome for the special advantage of the Romans. His Gospel was intended as a report of Peter's sermons to those people, made at their request. He omits all reference to the genealogy and birth of Jesus, the details of which would hardly be persuasive or appreciated by Roman readers. Accordingly he opens his Gospel at once by allusion to John the Baptist, and his witness to the activities of Christ's ministry, whose coming and presence John stood forth to proclaim.⁴

Then *the Apostle John*, "that disciple whom Jesus loved," at a later period wrote his Gospel especially for the indoctrination of the Christian Church. His object was to supplement the statements of the Synoptists' Gospels, supplying what they had omitted, and, wherever traversing the same ground, adding fresh details to their narratives, yet preserving, with the Synoptic Gospels, one central plan and unity of purpose. John's Gospel opens with the Godhead of Jesus Christ as the Word, devoting but a single sentence to his birth and incarnation: "And the Word became flesh and dwelt among us, and we beheld His glory."⁵

The four Evangelists amply illustrate that principle of credibility which obtains in the courts: circumstantial variation in the statement by witnesses evidences their substantial agreement and truth. These several writers had individuality of object in view in writing, with unity of design; and all were adapted to mankind in every age, country, and nation, having this one common end, viz.: "THESE THINGS ARE WRITTEN THAT YE MAY BELIEVE THAT JESUS IS THE CHRIST, THE SON OF GOD, AND THAT, BELIEVING, YE MAY HAVE LIFE IN HIS NAME."⁶

⁴ Mark i, 2-11. ⁵ John i, 14. ⁶ John xx, 31.

CONFIRMATION.

Attention may now be drawn to the testimony of *the adversaries* of the Christian religion for *confirmatory* witness respecting the statements in the Gospels on the § 25. *Opinions* Nativity of Jesus Christ. It is to be especially *not Evidential*. remarked that the *personal opinions* expressed by witnesses testifying are to be disregarded altogether. Mere opinions are not evidence, and can not be substituted for evidence. A heathen writer's belief does not prove a Christian fact, nor does his *disbelief* disprove it. It simply illustrates his mental attitude as a heathen toward Christ and Christianity. It is of no worth whatever in critical investigation. This is not saying, however, that *concessions* of fact and truth in the interests of history are to be set aside as being worthless in evidence. Upon the contrary, concessions made by an enemy are of vital and supreme importance in historical investigation, and conclusive of any contention. Sometimes, in opposition to Christianity, men have borne inadvertent witness to the truth by indirection, and in such a manner as to contribute to and corroborate that which has been affirmed by the Evangelists. An involuntary testimony thus given comes with more force than when it is voluntary. Even the denial of a certain occurrence conveys the implication that it had been affirmed by others as true, who possibly were in a better position to know the truth whereof they affirm than he who denies. For, why should denial be made at all of that which no one had ever claimed to be true, which had no existence in the conviction of others? Furthermore, the question affirmed and denied, if entitled to any consideration, related to something supposed to have existed in an earlier antiquity than when the denial was made. If, then, the adversaries, in denying, fail to refute the opposition, the validity of the conviction as based on truth on the part of the opposition stands, and legitimates the inquiry whether the conviction is not founded on fact. And in

the last analysis we are led back to inquire respecting the antiquity and authenticity of the New Testament which founds the Christian faith on the special facts narrated in its contents. That is, the faith is based on Jesus Christ, of whom we could have no proper knowledge except from these Scriptures.

WITNESS OF ENEMIES.

‘Since God is great and difficult to see, he put his own Spirit into his body that resembles ours, and sent it down to us, that we might be enabled to hear him, and become acquainted with him.’
 § 26. Testimony of Celsus. “If God had wished to send down his Spirit from himself, what need was there to breathe it into the womb of a woman?” “And, again, on account of Mary’s pregnancy there came an Angel to the carpenter” (*i. e.*, to Joseph). “The framers of the *genealogies*, from feeling of pride, made Jesus to be descended from the first man, and from the kings of the Jews. . . . The carpenter’s wife could not have been ignorant of the fact, had she been of such illustrious descent.”⁷

The testimony of the Emperor Julian, coming as it does at a later date (A. D. 361), furnishes a transitional point between
 § 27. Witness of Julian. “the faith once delivered to the saints” in the primitive Church succeeding the apostles, and that which has through all the centuries since held permanent place in Christian thought. Referring to the nativity of Jesus, Julian says:

α) “Jesus whom you celebrate was one of Cæsar’s subjects. If you dispute it, I will prove it. . . . For yourselves allow that *he was enrolled with his father and mother IN THE TIME OF QUIRINIUS*. But after he was born, what good did he do to his relations? For it is said that they would not believe on him.” “But Jesus having persuaded a few among you, and those the worst of men, has now been celebrated about *three hundred years*, having done nothing in his lifetime worthy of remembrance,”⁸ *etc.*

β) “For neither is he of Judah, and how should he be so when, according to you [Christians], he was *not* born of Joseph, but of the Holy Ghost? When you reckon up the *genealogy of Joseph*, you carry it up to Judah; but you have not been able to contrive this dexterously; for Matthew and Luke have been shown to differ with one another about the genealogy.” “Let this be said of God, though it is not; for she was

⁷ *Origen contra Celsum*, Bk. vi, 69, 73; v, 52; ii, 32.

⁸ *Citations from Cyril in Lard.* vii, 626, 627.

not a virgin. . . . However, grant that this also is said of him: does he [*i. e.*, the prophet], say that God should be born of a virgin? But you are continually calling Mary, Mother of God."⁹

The testimony of rabbinical works respecting the birth and incarnation of Jesus Christ is to the following effect:

a) The *Talmud* says: "After the two thousand years of the Law, according to the decree, the Messiah ought to have come." "The right time for Messiah's advent is passed, and he is now be- §28. The Wit-
 lieved to have been born;" "the appointed times are ness of the
 long since passed." "For the Messiah is born; his Jewish
 name is Menächem [Comforter]." "Messiah was born Rabbins.
 at the royal residence of Bethlehem of Judah." "Jesus of Nazareth was
 born in the year three thousand of creation, *under the Emperor Augustus.*
From this time begin the years of the Nazarene."¹⁰ "The Redeemer whom
 I will raise up among you shall not have a father, according to Zecha-
 riah." "The birth of the Messiah alone shall not be like that of any
 other creature." "The birth of Messiah alone shall be without defect
 [*i. e.*, sinless]." "None shall know his Father before he tells it."

β) *Toledoth Jeshu* concedes: That Jesus was born of royal lineage, and of the tribe of Judah; that he was the offspring of Joseph and Mary; that he claimed to have been born of a virgin; that his birth took place in Bethlehem of Judæa, *under the political rulers named by the evangelists.*

Such is the witness of the enemies of Jesus respecting his birth. The character and position of these writers lend the greater weight to their testimony. Celsus, the §29. Character
 conspicuous leader in the literary world of those of the Wit-
 whose hostility led them to assail Christianity nesses.
 and hold in ridicule the faith of the Christians, is the first in order. Julian, as emperor of the Roman world, commands attention in that he carried with him all the dignity of his office and the force of his authority, based upon the archives of the government. The Rabbins, who wrote the Jewish Talmud, represented the greatest teachers of the Jewish Church, arrayed in open opposition to Jesus of Nazareth and his cause; and the rabbinical writers of *Toledoth Jeshu*, who based their work on the Talmud, purporting to give, from the Jewish side of that period, a *History of Jesus*. These authors are men of

⁹ *Ib.* 625, 629, Θεοτόκον δὲ ἡμεῖς οὐ παύσασθε Μάριαν καλοῦντες.

¹⁰ Talmudic book called *Generations*.

eminence, whose writings reflect the manifold opposition which arose against the Christian Church in those times. Reference is made to the expected Messiahship, and to the nativity of Jesus. This testimony may now be analyzed, and the facts elicited compared with those contained in the Gospels.

A. *As to Celsus.* His witness relates to the incarnation, Joseph's dream, and the genealogies of Matthew and Luke.

§30. Analysis of the Testimonies. a) Living about a century after Christ's crucifixion, his testimony evidences by its opposition what had been the settled faith of the Christian Church from the beginning in respect to the incarnation of Jesus Christ. This tenet he ridicules in saying that "God put his Spirit into a body resembling ours, that we might become acquainted with him;" and then demands to know, "What need was there to breathe into the womb of a woman?"

β) Celsus confirms Matthew's account of the Angel's visit to Joseph in a dream respecting the chastity of his betrothed Mary when he says: "And again on account of Mary's pregnancy, there came an Angel to the carpenter."¹¹

γ) He distinctly employs the *plural number* when he mentions "*the framers of the genealogies*," as differing in their accounts of the ancestry of Joseph—Luke representing Christ's descent from Adam "the first man,"¹² which was his *natural* line of descent; and Matthew "his illustrious descent" "from the kings of the Jews."¹³ This discrimination is entirely correct, and states exactly what was the object of each genealogist in his tracing Christ's ancestry at all. Now it should be remarked that Celsus must have had *at that time* in his possession a copy of these Gospels, to have this knowledge. The Gospels, therefore, were in existence within a century of the crucifixion.

B. *As to Julian.* His testimony relates to the enrollment

¹¹ Matt. i, 18-21.

¹² Luke iii, 23-38.

¹³ Matt. i, 1-17.

of Quirinius, the chronology of Christ's birth, and to his being born of a virgin.

α) He affirms in a defiant tone, as that of one who felt entirely sure of his ground, that "Jesus was one of Cæsar's subjects." He even challenges the denial of his proposition, and offers to prove it. He then attests that "Jesus was enrolled with his father and mother *in the time of Quirinius.*"¹⁴

β) He dates the celebration (worship?) of Christ by the Christians, as "about three hundred years" before Julian's time. This chronological note is of great importance in determining "about" the time of Christ's nativity, proving its historicity in opposition to any possible mythical or legendary theory of Christ's life.

γ) Julian also introduces the discussion in dispute of the fact that Jesus was "born of a virgin;"¹⁵ and he is indignant that the early Christians about him were "continually calling Mary, Mother of God."

C. *As to the Talmud.* The Rabbins of this work declare a *gradually increasing faith* in Messiah's birth; that he *ought to have been born*; that the time of his birth is now *long past*; that they *believe* that his birth has occurred; and finally they affirm that it *certainly did occur at Bethlehem*. They also make allusions to his incarnation.

α) Among other averments respecting Messiah they unhesitatingly declare: "He ought to have come," "The right time for Messiah's advent is passed;" "The appointed times have long since passed;" "He is believed to have been born;" and "Messiah WAS BORN at the royal residence of Bethlehem of Judah." They also testify that "*Jesus of Nazareth was born under the Emperor Augustus, from which time begin the years of the Nazarene.*"

β) Of the incarnation they assert that "*The Redeemer will not have a father,*" that "the birth of the Messiah shall not"

¹⁴ Gr. Κυρήνιος, Cyrenius; but in Latin, Quirinius, Luke ii, 1-7.

¹⁵ Isa. vii, 14; Matt. 1, 23.

be like that of other men; that it "shall be without defect;" and that "none shall know the Father before he tells it."

D. The *Toledoth Jeshu* refers specifically to Christ's lineage, his tribe, his mother and her virginity; and mentions definitely the place of his birth as Bethlehem in Judah, and cites the same political rulers as are recorded in the Gospels.

§31. Reconfirmation.

Brief corroborations from Ignatius of Antioch, one of the Apostolic Fathers; from Tertullian, of Carthage, Africa, one of the Apologists or Defenders of the Faith before the government; and from one apostle of Jesus Christ, will sufficiently represent Christian teaching, and the main points which are substantiated by foregoing testimonies of the enemies of the Christian religion.

a) Witness of Ignatius (110): "Jesus Christ, who, after the flesh, was of David's race, who was the Son of God."¹⁶ "He was truly of the race of David according to the flesh, but Son of God by the Divine will and power, truly born of a virgin."¹⁷

β) Witness of Tertullian (200): "For it behooves Him to proceed from the tribe of Judah, and from Bethlehem."¹⁸

γ) Witness of the Apostle Paul (56-58):* "The Gospel of God . . . concerning his Son, who was born of the seed of David according to the flesh, who was declared to be the Son of God with power, . . . even Jesus Christ our Lord."¹⁹ "Whose are the fathers, and of whom is Christ as concerning the flesh, who is over all, God blessed forever. Amen."²⁰ "But when the fullness of time came, God sent forth his Son, born of a woman, born under the law."²¹ "God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself."²² "The first man is of the earth, earthy; the second Man is of heaven."²³

A review of these testimonies is now in place. The witness of Celsus is first in order. From his mention of those who composed the "genealogies" it is obvious that he referred to the Gospels of Matthew and Luke, which he must have had in his possession, as he could not possibly have had command of such tables by sheer oral tra-

* ὁ δεύτερος ἄνθρωπος ὁ κύριος ἐξ οὐρανοῦ

¹⁶ *Epis. to Ephesians*, c. 20.

¹⁸ *Ans. to Jews*, c. 13.

²⁰ *Ib.* ix, 5.

²² *2 Cor.* v, 19.

¹⁷ *Ep. to Smyrneans*, c. 1.

¹⁹ *Rom.* i, 1-4.

²¹ *Gal.* iv, 4.

²³ *1 Cor.* xv, 47.

dition. It may here be remarked in general, as will hereafter appear, that Celsus makes numerous references to facts and occurrences, as well as many citations from both the Gospels and Epistles, with such exactness that it compels the belief that he was in possession of a copy of the New Testament at that time; accordingly, it is evident that these Scriptures must have been published a very considerable time before, that they should have fallen into the hands of enemies at such an early period.

Celsus is clearly right in perceiving that Matthew's genealogy demonstrated Christ's descent "from the kings of the Jews," while Luke's made Jesus to have descended "from the first man;" but he was as clearly wrong in his inference that the difference meant a discrepancy in the two representations of Christ's ancestry. The lineage traced by Luke is that of the race; the lineage traced by Matthew is that of royalty. Luke, therefore, gives the natural descent by parentage as seemingly taken from the family registry of births which each house was required to keep with strictness; Matthew notes the actual succession of the kings from the throne of David, taken apparently from the records preserved in the public archives. If the natural descent ceased, as in the case of Jechonias, the line renewed itself through the nearest relative, who was also a royal descendant; for this was according to the express provision of Jewish law.²⁴ It is thus that Nathan, through Salathiel and Zerubbabel, appears in the genealogical line of Joseph. Now, Joseph and Mary were cousins, and the two lines are as much Mary's as they are Joseph's; the difference consisting not in the fact, but in its form of expression. "Females are named in genealogies when there is anything remarkable about them, or when any right or property is transmitted through them."*

*Smith's *Bible Dictionary*, "Genealogy," and "Genealogy of Jesus."

²⁴Num. xxvii, 8-11.

In respect to "the wedded maid and virgin mother" of our Lord, Celsus admits without dispute the nativity of Jesus at the accepted date as historical, that its occurrence was in a Jewish village, and that Joseph was a carpenter. These concessions, regarded by him as historical, authenticate the narrative of the Gospels. That certain other facts were claimed by Christian people as related to the birth of Jesus, his very contention demonstrates. Now, it is not to be presumed that Celsus sought to refute postulates which had never been claimed, nor yet those events which occurred in times later than his own. He is content to deny the virginity of Mary, but reflects in unwarrantable terms upon her character and motherhood without the slightest verification by facts or justification in right reasoning. This is in bad taste for one professing to be a philosopher. By implication here, and elsewhere by direct assertion, Celsus denies that Jesus was "the Son of God sent down from heaven." This, of course, was intended as a denial of the Christly incarnation. But his denial was obviously based upon his ignorance of the facts involved; for how was it possible for him to know anything whatever respecting Jesus being begotten* by the Holy Spirit? No man has a right to make denial on the ground of sheer ignorance. The case is simply inscrutable to human cognition. That, however, is no bar to a rational belief. We are constantly accepting facts in nature which transcend our scrutiny. We can not rationally account for the origin and unity of our conscience or moral nature with our thinking or intellectual nature. And if we can not explain the genesis and organization of our own mental constitution so as to render it intelligible to another, clearly we are debarred from demanding an explanation of the origin and conditions involved in the incarnation of Jesus Christ.

* Γεννάω, applied to men, means *to beget*; to women, *to give birth to*. See Matt. 1, 2, 16; Luke 1, 13, 57, etc.

We can not rationally account for the fact that the acorn germinates and grows into an oak ; but we know it to be a fact. We do not have to believe *how* the grass grows, but we believe *that* it grows. No man can offer an explanation as to the genesis and unity into which our spirit and body enter before birth, and afterward are held in a continuous organization of life ; but that does not disprove that we now exist. In any strict sense, the incarnation does not lie within the scope of historical investigation. In so far as from his sublime place and power in the world, to which Jesus Christ has been assigned in history, and in which he alone has illustrated the high character and claim of being the GOD-MAN, to that extent, but no further, is the incarnation a legitimate subject for historical study.

In concluding this chapter the following particulars should be noted :

1. Julian asserts and associates absolutely the enrollment of Quirinius with the birth of Jesus Christ, which he affirms occurred "about three hundred years" before his own time. these two circumstances fix the date of the beginning of the Christian era in accordance with the accepted Christian chronology.

2. Both Celsus and Julian base their arguments on *the genealogies* of Jesus as contained in the first and third Gospels. This evidences that the Gospels were written and published a considerable while before the time of either. Neither knows of any other account than that recorded in these Scriptures. The Gospels known to be *spurious*, which did not appear until the middle of the second century, *are not cited by any adversary of Christianity as authoritative.*

3. Both these writers refer pointedly to the virginity of Mary ; but, beyond expressing his personal opinion respecting the fact, neither undertakes to refute it, nor affirms that the account dates later than the time of the Nativity. This at

least rescues the narrative from being a myth or legend which requires a long period of time for accretions, and *then* finding credence.

4. The *Talmud* concedes that the time for Messiah's birth is long since past, but affirms that it certainly occurred at Bethlehem; alleging, also, that Jesus of Nazareth was born in the reign of Augustus Cæsar. To an investigator it is easy to see that Jesus Christ was the Messiah of the Jews, and that his birth is correctly ascribed to the time of Augustus as in the Gospel.

5. The *Toledoth Jeshu* also designates Bethlehem as the place of Christ's birth, declaring his royal lineage from David, his proper tribe of Judah, and the rulers of the country as mentioned in the Gospels.

6. As *reconfirmation*, Ignatius of Syria reiterates the Christian claim that Jesus was descended from David and was born of a virgin; and Tertullian attests the place of his birth was Bethlehem; and, finally, Paul announces Jesus as "the seed of David according to the flesh," who was declared to be "the Son of God with power . . . by the resurrection from the dead."

CHAPTER III.

CIRCUMSTANCES CONCURRENT WITH THE
NATIVITY.

- I. JOSEPH'S FLIGHT INTO EGYPT.
- II. HEROD'S MASSACRE AT BETHLEHEM.
- III. WISE MEN AND THE STAR OF THE EAST.
- IV. HEROD'S DEATH AND AN ECLIPSE.
- V. REGISTRATION OF CYRENIUS (QUIRINIUS).

63

CHAPTER III.

CIRCUMSTANCES CONCURRENT WITH THE NATIVITY.

§ 34. Sources: Biographical Epitomes of Witnesses, and Literature.

1. JUSTIN MARTYR (110-165), the proper name of whom was FLAVIUS JUSTIN, the surname having reference to the mode of his death. Tertullian was the first to designate him "Philosopher and Martyr." (*Against the Valentinians*, c. 5.) He was of Greek origin and education, although born in Shechem, Central Palestine. In youth he traveled extensively, being in great spiritual unrest, and sought consolation in different schools of Philosophy—the Stoical system, Peripatetic, and the Platonic—but neither of these supplied the cravings of his spirit. One day, while walking along the seaside, he met a venerable man of benignant countenance, with whom he had very earnest conversation about his unsatisfied consciousness. The stranger counseled him to study the Hebrew prophets. He did so, continuing his investigations in the Gospels as to the fulfillment of prophecy. He became converted before the year 133. Thenceforth he devoted himself to the diligent study and teaching of Christian doctrines. He acquired great scholarship in the Scriptures, but continued to wear his philosopher's garb to indicate that now he had become possessor of the true philosophy of life.

"Justin forms the transition from the Apostolic Fathers, properly so called." (Schaff.) Eusebius remarks of Justin: "A genuine lover of true philosophy, in the gown of a philosopher, he proclaimed the Divine Word and defended the faith by his writings." (B. iv, c. 11.) Much is said of his genius, learning and faithfulness in his Christian activities, for he was an evangelist missionary. "He lived at a time when the profession of Christ was a crime under the Roman law against secret societies and prohibited religions." (Schaff.) Justin stood with fearless courage for the cause of truth when it was most fiercely assailed by violence, and finally attested his faith as a confessor and martyr for Christ. The testimony of Eusebius and most credible historians renders it nearly certain that he suffered martyrdom in the reign of Marcus Aurelius, who reigned 161-180. The *Chronicon Paschale* gives as the date of his death A. D. 165. (*Ante-Nicene Fathers*, I, 160.) He was first scourged, and then beheaded, under the order of Rusticus, the prefect of Rome.

The principal works of Justin are his two *Apologies*, addressed to the emperors and the Roman Senate, and his famous *Dialogue with Trypho the Jew* whom Justin sought to convert to the Christian faith. "Eusebius mentions two *Apologies*; one written in the reign of Antoninus Pius, the other in the reign of Marcus Aurelius." (*Ante-Nicene Fathers*, Vol. I, 161, Am. ed.)

2. IRENÆUS (120-202) was probably born at Smyrna, Asia Minor. He was a disciple of Polycarp, and the "spirit of his preceptor passed over him." His philosophical genius, practical common sense, and his Greek learning combined to make him a remarkable man in the early Church. He was almost within touch of the Fountainhead of Christianity, through his teacher Polycarp, and his grand teacher the apostle John. He was both the leading representative and champion of orthodoxy in the Church of his day, as well as the mediator between the Eastern and Western Churches. Irenæus succeeded to the episcopacy at Lyons, France, after the defeat of Ponthinius in A. D. 178. He disappears from sight about 190, but whether he died a natural death is now unknown. A very remarkable fact is, that he alludes to or cites every writing of the evangelists and apostles except Philemon, and the third Epistle of John. He wrote *Against Heresies*, some fragments of which remain.
3. ALFRED EDERSHEIM, A. M., D. D., Ph. D., the learned author of the *Life and Time of Jesus the Messiah* (2 vols., 2d ed., Oxford, 1884); and *Prophecy and History in Relation to the Messiah* (New York, 1885). The writer is said to have been thoroughly educated in all Talmudic literature for a Jewish Rabbi, but became a Christian and a specialist on the subjects cited. His eminence makes him an authority on the line of Messianic argument.

§ 35. Accompaniments of the Nativity.

And the Gentiles shall come to thy Light, and kings to the brightness of thy rising. The multitude of camels shall cover thee, and the dromedaries of Midian and Ephah; all they from Sheba shall come; they shall bring gold and incense, and they shall show forth the praises of the Lord.—ISAIAH.

I shall see him, but not now; I shall behold him, but not nigh. There shall come a Star out of Jacob, and a Scepter shall arise out of Israel.—BALAAM.

Messiah himself shall appear in the north, and his advent will be marked by a star. Jesus of Nazareth was born under the Emperor Augustus. From this time begin the years of the Nazarene.—TALMUD.

Where is he that is born King of the Jews? for we saw his star in the east, and are come to worship him.—THE MAGI.

If he be not the Messiah, there has been at least none other before or after him. If he be not the Messiah, the world has not, and never can have, a Messiah.—EDERSHEIM.

ARGUMENT.

Ten notable facts, each an occurrence of historical interest in itself, concenter in the birth and infancy of "the Holy Child Jesus." It is a significant circumstance that the case of Christ has no parallel in history. The angelic admonition respecting Mary, the flight and return of the family, the star of the east which awakened such profound interest in distant peoples, the visit of the Wise Men to the infant Jesus, the gifts and worship of the Magi, the massacre of the male children at Bethlehem, the motive of King Herod in this slaughter, the timely death of this infamous ruler,—are not a meaningless record of the sacred text. All these and other particulars are narrated by but one Evangelist. Nevertheless, every circumstance finds ample confirmation in profane writings: traditional, rabbinical, heathen, patristic, and apostolic.

To these concurrent circumstances of the Nativity there remains to be added the witness of several writers of fame respecting the *time and place* of its occurrence, with special reference to the *first enrollment* or census of population made under Quirinius at Bethlehem, which fixes the beginning of the Christian Era. This is attested by the imperial Julian, by Christian apologists, by the testimony of two Romans of great distinction, and by monumental testimony and inscriptions at Rome. These sources of early literature legitimate the induction that the narratives of Matthew and Luke are both ancient and authentic.

1. A Group of Concurrent Circumstances connected with the Birth of Jesus.
2. An Astronomical Argument based on the Moon's Eclipse at Herod's Death.
3. An Argument from Science founded on the Conjunction of Several Planets.
4. The Chronology and Locality of Christ's Birth as related to Quirinius.

JOSEPH'S FAMILY AND EGYPT.

Circumstances of an interesting character group about the Nativity of Jesus. Each historical fact has a significant bearing upon the central event. Matthew narrates these particulars: §36. Joseph and Family.

"Behold an angel of the Lord appeareth to Joseph in a dream, saying, Arise and take the young Child and his mother and flee into Egypt, and be thou there until I tell thee; for Herod will seek the young Child

to destroy him. . . . But when Herod was dead, behold an angel of the Lord appeareth in a dream to Joseph in Egypt saying, Arise and take the young Child and his mother and go into the land of Israel, for they are dead that sought the young Child's life. And he arose and took the young Child and his mother and came into the land of Israel."¹

CONFIRMATION.

Celsus admits three main facts respecting Jesus, the *flight*, *stay* in, and the *return* from Egypt, besides the offices of the angel; but his reference to Mary's condition as the occasion for fleeing, and the assumption that Jesus remained in Egypt until grown up, and hired out as a servant because of poverty, are as unhistorical as they are gratuitous. He says:

"And again on account of the pregnancy of Mary, there came an angel to the carpenter, and once more an angel, in order that they might take up the young Child and flee away"² [into Egypt]. "What need was there that you, while still an infant, should be conveyed into Egypt? Was it to escape being murdered? But, then, it was not likely that God should be afraid of death: and yet an angel came down from heaven commanding you and your friends to flee, lest you should be captured, and be put to death. And was not the great God who had already sent two angels on your account, able to keep you, his only Son, in safety?"³ "Having hired himself out as a servant in Egypt on account of his poverty, and having there acquired some miraculous powers on which the Egyptians pride themselves, he returned to his own country, elated on account of them, and by means of these proclaimed himself a God."⁴

THE CHILDREN OF BETHLEHEM.

§ 37. *Slaying of the Infants.* Respecting the massacre of the children of Bethlehem, the first Gospel contains the record of the fact which occasioned the flight of Joseph and his family into Egypt:

"Then Herod, when he saw that he was mocked of the Wise Men, was exceeding wroth, and sent forth and slew all the male children that there were in Bethlehem, and in all the borders thereof, from two years old and under, according to the time which he had carefully learned of the Wise Men."⁵

¹ Matt. ii, 13, 19, 20, 21.

² *Origen contra Celsum*, V. 52.

³ *Ib.* I, 66.

⁴ *Ib.* I, 28.

⁵ Matt. ii, 16.

a) Celsus says:

“Chaldæans are spoken of by Jesus as having been induced to come to him at his birth and to worship him as a God while yet an infant; and to have made this known to Herod the tetrarch; and that the latter sent and slew all the infants that had been born about the same time, thinking that in this way he would insure his death among the others; and that he was led to do this through fear that, if Jesus lived to sufficient age, he would obtain the throne.”* “But if this was done in order that you might not reign in his stead, when you had grown up to man’s estate, why, after you did reach that estate, do you not become a king, instead of you the Son of God, wandering about in so mean a condition, hiding yourself through fear, and leading a miserable life up and down?”⁶

β) Macrobius, a rhetorician (A. D. 110), records a joke perpetrated by the Emperor Augustus upon receiving information, at the same time, that Herod had slain his own son, Antipater, near the same time that he slew the children of Bethlehem:

“When he heard that, among the male children within two years of age which Herod the king of the Jews commanded to be slain in Syria, his own son had been killed, he said: ‘*It is better to be Herod’s hog than to be his son.*’”⁷

γ) The *Toledoth Jeshu* says:

“And the king [Herod the Great] gave orders for putting to death every infant to be found in Bethlehem, and the king’s messengers killed every infant according to the royal order.”

*It is not within the purpose of this work on Historical Evidences to undertake to refute the adversaries of Christianity so much as to gather concessions and facts from their writings to substantiate the statements in the historical New Testament. Nevertheless, the utterly uncritical character of Celsus, in these criticisms and strictures upon these Sacred Writings, should not go wholly unexposed. This champion of literary opposition to Christ and Christianity has here compacted into a single sentence no less than four gross misstatements in matters of fact, professedly taken from the Gospels themselves: 1. *Jesus* did not say one word about the Wise Men coming to Christ’s birth, but Matthew makes a different statement. 2. The Chaldæans are not mentioned at all in any of the four Gospels, but the Magi (Μάγοι). 3. There was no “*Herod the tetrarch*” in existence when Jesus was born; it was “*Herod the king.*” 4. The king did not order slain “*ALL* the infants born about the same time,” but *all the male infants*: ἀνείλεν πάντας τοὺς παῖδας (Matt. ii, 16).

⁶ *Origen contra Celsum*, I, 58, 61. ⁷ “*Melius est Herodis porcum esse quam filium*” (*Saturnalia, Convivia*, ii, 4). Some suppose a play on the words ὄς *sow*, and υῖός *son*. ὄς, however, is both *masculine* and *feminine* gender.

“When the royal power was conferred on the Maccabees in the person of Simon, *it was with an express reservation of the rights of the Messiah.*” But this royal criminal, § 38. Herod's Crimes. who had killed Hyrcanus his favorite wife's grandfather, Mariamne herself, and their two sons, Alexander and Aristobulus, thereby extinguishing the priestly and royal house of the Asmonean race or the Maccabees, the last and rightful contestants to the throne; who did not hesitate to destroy whole families supposed to be in opposition to his wishes; who ordered all the nobles of the land to assemble when on his death-bed, then shut them up in the hippodrome⁸ with orders that, immediately after he had died, these nobles should be massacred, in order that his own funeral might at least *appear* to be the occasion for universal sorrow instead of universal joy and gladness, as he seems to have consciously apprehended would be deserved in his case,—why should it ever have been thought to be incredible that such a royal wretch would slaughter a dozen children at Bethlehem, if thereby he might place beyond recall the heir apparent to the throne of Israel? In his passionate jealousy, Herod sought to destroy the predicted *King of the kingdom*. The infant Jesus occupying a manger in a stable, is an object of terror to the ruling Herod!

As Lange justly remarks:

“The Jews and priests were pleased that Simon should be governor until there should arise a *Faithful Prophet*.” Certain measures relating to the temple were adopted temporarily “until there should come a Prophet to show them what should be done.” “While the Asmoneans [Maccabees] enjoyed the royal dignity, with the express acknowledgment that the scepter belonged to the coming Prophet, Herod [himself] recognized no such expected Messiah, or, rather, entertained only superstitious fears about him, and cherished the desire of effecting his destruction.” “*It is noteworthy that the same Herod who had already extinguished the priestly and royal house of the Maccabees, by the murder of the last heirs, also attempted to destroy the true and eternal Royalty of the House of David*”⁹ *by the same means.*

⁸ Joseph. *Ant.* xvii, 6, 5. ⁹ Commentary on Matt. ii 1; cf. I Macc. xiv, 41; iv, 46.

THE WISE MEN AND THE STAR.

“The Star in the East” was the remarkable sign given in fulfillment of the famous prediction of Balaam, the Moses of the Midianites: “*I shall see him, but not now; §39. The Magi I shall behold him, but not nigh. There shall come and the Star. a Star out of Jacob, and a Scepter shall arise out of Israel. Out of Jacob shall He come that shall have dominion.*”¹⁰ Matthew is the only Evangelist who notes the mission of the Magi who had crossed streams, mountains, and deserts guided by the presence of a single star to the feet of the infant Jesus. They ask Herod, “*Where is he that is born King of the Jews, for we saw his star in the east, and are come to worship him?*”¹¹ Dr. Philip Schaff remarks:

“The Savior was not without witness amongst the *heathen*. ‘Wise men from the East’—that is, Persian Magi of the Zend religion, in which the idea of a Zoziash or *Redeemer* was clearly known—guided miraculously by a star or meteor created for the purpose, came and sought out the Savior to pay him homage. . . . We must suppose that God saw good to speak to the Magi in their own way; they were seeking light from the study of the stars, whence only physical light could be found; and he guided them to the Source of spiritual light, to the cradle of his Son, by a star made to appear to them, and to speak intelligibly to them through their preconceptions.”¹²

An Oriental writer relates the following interesting tradition as having been the address made by the Magi to King Herod on the occasion of their visit to Jerusalem, and their inquiry, “Where is he that is born King of the Jews?”

§ 40. Traditional
Testimony.

a) “A certain person of great note among us, in a book which he composed, warned us in it mentioning these things: A child that shall descend from heaven will be born in Palestine whom the greatest part of the world shall serve; and the sign of his appearance shall be this: Ye shall see a strange star which shall direct you where he is; when ye see this, take gold, myrrh, and frankincense and go offer them to him and worship him; and then return, lest a greater calamity befall you. Now the star has appeared to us, and we have come to perform what he has commanded us.”¹³

¹⁰ Num. xxiv, 17, 19. ¹¹ Matt. ii, 1, 2. ¹² Smith's *Bib. Dict.*, Vol. II, p. 1349, Am. ed.

¹³ Rabbi Frey's *Messiah*, 138, citing Abulyshrag, *Hist. Dynasty*, p. 70.

β) The Nestorians claim that Zoroaster was a disciple of one of the Jewish Prophets.

“The intercommunication of opinions between the Jewish and Zoroastrian religions throws great light on the visit of the Magi or Wise Men at Jerusalem . . . who had come more immediately in contact with the Babylonian Jews.”¹⁴ “Now this Zoroaster appears to have been a Jew both by birth and religion, and servant to one of the Prophets of Israel, and well versed in the sacred writings, and therefore may well be supposed to have learned all this from the prophecy of Balaam.”¹⁵

The late Dr. Nehemiah Adams, in mentioning that the Nestorians “are confident of the truth of the general belief that Oroomiah was the residence of the renowned Zoroaster,” says:

“As their tradition is remarkably corroborated by Abulpharagius, I will quote his language: ‘Zeradsht [Zoroaster], the preceptor of the Magi, taught the Persians concerning the manifestation of Christ, and ordered them to bring gifts to him in token of their reverence and submission. He declared that in the latter day a pure virgin should conceive, and as soon as the child was born a star would appear, blazing even at noonday with undiminished luster. You, my sons, exclaimed the venerable seer, will perceive its rising before any other nation. As soon, therefore, as you shall see the star, follow it whithersoever it shall lead you. HE IS THE ALMIGHTY WORD WHO CREATED THE HEAVENS.’”¹⁶

γ) A Platonic philosopher named Caludius, who was not a Christian, says:

“There is also a venerable and sacred history which speaks of the rising of a certain unusual star, not foretelling disease and death, but the descent of a venerable God, born for the sake of human conversation [*i. e.*, conduct, life] and the affairs of mortals; which star truly, when the wise men of the Chaldeans saw in their journey by night, and being very expert in their considerations of celestial things, are said to have inquired after the birth of the new Deity, and having found the infant Majesty, to worship him and pay their vows worthy of such a God.”¹⁷

WITNESS OF ENEMIES.

a) *Talmud*: “Messiah himself shall appear in the North, and his advent will be marked by a Star.”¹⁸ “When Messiah shall be revealed, there shall rise up in the East a certain star flaming with six sorts of colors.”¹⁹ “The star shall shine forth from the East, and this is the star of the Messiah. It shall shine forth from the East for fifteen days, and if it be prolonged it will

¹⁴ Milman's *Hist. Christianity*, I, 114.

¹⁵ R. Frey's *Messiah*, 138, comp. Prideaux' *Connections*, I, 207, 208, Part i, Bk. iv.

¹⁶ *Friends of Christ*, 31.

¹⁷ Cited in Frey's *Messiah*, 138, from Fabricius's *Bibliotheca Latina*, 142-146.

¹⁸ Schöttgen, *Horæ Hebraicæ et Talmudicæ*, 538, 531.

¹⁹ Frey's *Messiah*, 137.

be for the good of Israel.”²⁰ “The King Messiah shall be revealed in the land of Galilee; and lo, a star in the East shall swallow up seven stars of the North, and a flame of red fire shall be in the firmament for six days.”²¹

β) Those Jews who are still looking for the Messiah to come, confidently expect a star to appear *as the sign of his advent*. It was also so in the early Christian centuries; a fact which explains why that Messianic impostor succeeded so well in the reign of Hadrian,* who assumed the name Bar-Kokheba—*i. e., the son of a star*—and issued coins bearing a star, in allusion to Balaam’s prediction. In his open rebellion against the Romans he effected a large following from the Jews, and, when captured, he proposed that if the Romans should kill him he would prove his Messiahship by rising from the dead! The Romans took him at his word, and cut off his head. As the impostor did not rise from the dead, the Jews in disgust named him Bar-Kozibar; *i. e., the son of a lie!*²²

Origen, in reply to Celsus, says:

“In the next place he [Celsus] runs away to what immediately follows the narrative of the birth of Jesus—the account of the star and of the Wise Men who came from the East to worship the Child.”

“He makes numerous quotations from the Gospel according to Matthew, as the star that appeared at the birth of Christ.” “I know not, moreover, why he has passed by in silence the cause which led the Magi to come, and why he has not stated, according to the Scriptural account, that it was a star seen by them in the east.”²³

WITNESS OF FRIENDS.

a) Irenæus refers to the Magi, their adoration and their gifts to the Child,† and their return home by way of the Assyrians.²⁴

* A. D. 117-138.

† “The adoration of the Magi is a favorite part of the picture of the Holy Family. . . . Mary sits holding the babe in her lap, and receiving the homage of the Magi. . . . In later pictures the star is added.” (Schaff, *Hist. Christian Church*, II, 282, 283.) The picture taken from the Catacombs is supposed to date as early as the third, if not the second century. The Romanists claim that the adoration of Mary must have antedated the picture. But what justification is there that Mary is the adored one at all? The presence of the mother with her Child is indispensably natural, if not necessary, as otherwise the suggestiveness would be lost. How could the young and dependent Child appear alone? It is clearly intended to represent Matthew’s account how that the Magi “came into the house and saw the young Child and his mother, [and] THEY FELL DOWN AND WORSHIPED HIM”—not the mother. (Matt. ii, 2, 8, 11.)

²⁰ Edersheim’s *Jesus of Nazareth*, I, 212.

²¹ Frey’s *Messiah*, 137.

²² Schaff, *Ch. Hist.*, I, 402. ²³ *Orig. cont. Cels.*, I, 40, 34, 58.

²⁴ *Heresies*, B. iii, c. 16, 4.

β) Justin Martyr mentions the Magi coming from Herod; also the star in the heavens, and, learning from the Jewish elders where Christ should be born, they "came to Bethlehem and worshiped the Child, and presented him with gold, frankincense, and myrrh, and then returned not to Herod."²⁵

γ) Tertullian refers to the Magi as astrologers from the East; that "the interpreters of the stars were the first to announce Christ's birth, the first to offer him gifts, . . . frankincense, and myrrh, and gold, . . . the close of worldly sacrifice, and the glory which Christ was about to do away." He also mentions that the Magi returned home by another way.²⁶

ARGUMENTS FROM SCIENCE.

α) There is much force, if not absolute conclusiveness in verification of Matthew's account of the wonderful star, in § 44. Tradition and Science. the modern discovery of astronomy. It is to be noted that the learned Jewish Rabbi, named *Arbabanel* (or, properly, *Abrabanel*), in his Commentary on Daniel entitled *Wells of Salvation*, published in 1547, mentions the tradition of the Jews that there was a conspicuous conjunction of planets which occurred three years before the birth of Moses, in the *sign Pisces*; and that another conjunction would occur before the Messiah's birth. As this did happen in A. D. 1463, when *Abrabanel* was living, he was confident that the circumstances indicated the near approach of Messiah's advent, so that he requested the astronomers to investigate this subject. "Ideler and Wieseler conjecture that this astronomical belief existed among the Jews already at the time of Christ."²⁷

β) *Abrabanel's* publication of the Jewish tradition was fifty years prior to the discovery of the great § 45. Astronomers' Conclusions. Kepler, published in 1606-1614, which was a conjunction of the planets Jupiter and Saturn, with Mars added later, and occurred repeatedly in A. U. 747

²⁵ *Dialogue with Trypho*, 78. ²⁶ *Idolatries* c., ix. ²⁷ Schaff, *Ch. Hist.* I, 115, n. 2.

and 748, in the sign Pisces. Kepler's calculation has been corroborated by several eminent astronomers in independent investigations—including Schubert's of Petersburg, Charles Pritchard's of London, honorable secretary of the Royal Astronomical Society, and Ideler's and Encke's of Berlin. Pritchard affirms the fact of the conjunction to be "as certain as any astronomical phenomenon of ancient date;"²⁸ Ideler insists that "the star of astrology has become the torch of chronology."²⁹ Schaff adds: "It certainly makes the pilgrimage of the Magi to Jerusalem and Bethlehem more intelligible."³⁰ Pritchard says:

"To complete the fascination of the tale, about an hour and a half after sunset the two planets [Jupiter and Saturn] might be seen from Jerusalem, hanging as it were in the meridian, and suspended over Bethlehem in the distance. These celestial phenomena thus described are, it will be seen, beyond the reach of question; and at first impression they assuredly appear to fulfill the conditions of the Star of the Magi."³¹

Dr. Edersheim states that—

"In the astronomical tables of the *Chinese*—to whose general trustworthiness so high an authority as Humboldt bears testimony—the appearance of an evanescent star was noted. Pingré and others have designated it as a comet, and calculated its first appearance in February, in 750 A. U. C., which was just the time when the Magi would, in all probability, leave Jerusalem, since this must have preceded the death of Herod, which took place in March, 750. Moreover, it has been astronomically ascertained that such a sidereal apparition would be visible to those who left Jerusalem, and that it would point—seem almost to go before—in the direction of, and stand over, Bethlehem. Such, impartially stated, are the facts of the case; and here the subject must, in the present state of our information, be left."³²

γ) "If we accept the result of these calculations of the astronomers, we are brought to within two years of the year of the Nativity, namely, between A. U. 748 (Kepler), and 750 §46. Schaff's Induction. (Wieseler). The difference arises, of course, from the uncertainty of the time of the departure, and the length of the journey of the Magi."³³

²⁸ See Schaff, *Ch. Hist.* I, 115.

²⁹ *Ib.* I, 116.

³⁰ *Ib.* I, 116.

³¹ *Ib.* I, 118, 119.

³² *Jesus the Messiah*, I, 213.

³³ Schaff, *Ch. Hist.* I, 116.

KING HEROD'S DEATH.

It is obvious that Herod the Great was living when Christ was born, from the circumstance that he sought "the young §47. Moon's Child to destroy him." Exactly when King Eclipse. Herod died is astronomically ascertained, and the event occurred, probably within a few months after the Nativity. His death took place just before the time of the Jewish Passover, in the city of Jericho, in the valley of the Jordan, on the 13th of March A. U. 750, or, according to our common chronology, in B. C. 4. Josephus has noted a circumstance which affords a *datum* for a scientific investigation, in saying, "*That very night there was an eclipse of the moon;*"³⁴ and what renders the fact the more conspicuous is, that this is the only eclipse mentioned by this historian. Now, if the Star of the East was the product of the conjunction of the planets Jupiter, Saturn, and Mars in A. U. 748 as held by Kepler, then Jesus was born six years before the current Christian era; but if, on the other hand, the star was identical with the comet of 750, as claimed by Pingré, then Jesus was born B. C. 4. Nevertheless, Wieseler, who is in agreement with Kepler as to the conjunction of the planets, places the date of that event at A. U. 750, or coincident with the year in which Herod died, B. C. 4; the discrepancy between Kepler and Wieseler being due to the uncertain time when the Magi started upon their journey, and the length of the route. By all accounts, therefore, Christ was crucified, not in A. D. 33, as is generally supposed, but in A. D. 29.

In respect to the era of Christianity, Dr. Edward Robinson says:

"The present Christian era which was fixed by the abbot Dionysius Exiguus in the sixth century, assumes the year of the Christian era as coincident with the year 754 from the building of Rome. §48. The Christian Era. Our era begins in any case more than four years too late; *i. e.*, from four to five years after the actual birth of Christ. This era was first used in historical works by the Venerable

³⁴ *Ant.* xvii, 6, 4.

Bede early in the sixth century, and was not long after introduced in public transactions by the French kings, Pepin and Charlemagne.”³⁵

This does not mean that the monk Exiguus *invented* the Christian era, but he *computed* it. Considering the *data* at his command at that time, his work is as remarkable for its difficulty as for its measure of success.

ENROLLMENTS UNDER QUIRINIUS.

Luke’s statement furnishes another *datum* for determining the time of Christ’s birth. In his particularizations, for which he is so remarkable, he introduces the enrollment of Quirinius as a concurrent event with the Nativity. He says:

§ 49. Registration of Quirinius.

“Now it came to pass in those days, there went out a decree from Cæsar Augustus that all the world should be enrolled. This was the first enrollment made when Quirinius³⁶ was governor of Syria. And all went to enroll themselves, every one to his own city. And Joseph also went up from Galilee, out of the city of Nazareth, into Judæa to the city of David which is called Bethlehem, because he was of the house and family of David, to enroll himself with Mary, who was betrothed to him, being great with child. And it came to pass while they were there, the days were fulfilled that she should be delivered; and she brought forth her firstborn son.”³⁷

In making this historical statement respecting Quirinius, as an incident to that fact, the Evangelist introduces the itinerary of Joseph and Mary from Nazareth to Bethlehem, and the occasion which explains that movement. It was precisely this enrollment and the mode of its procedure—a circumstance so incidentally mentioned as related to Christ’s birth and so significant in itself—which brought these persons from their quiet homes in the North, to their ancestral village, and into the tribal territory of Judæa, *in exact circumstantial fulfillment of prophecy*, “in the city where David dwelt.” Micah’s prediction was:

“But thou Bethlehem Ephrathah, which art little to be among the thousands of Judah, out of thee shall One come forth unto me, that is to be Ruler in Israel, whose goings forth are from of old, from everlasting.”³⁸

³⁵ Robinson’s *Greek Harmony of the Gospels*. ³⁶ “Cyrenius” is derived from the Greek Κυρήνιος, but “Quirinius” was his proper Roman name.

³⁷ Luke’s Gospel, ii, 1-7. ³⁸ Micah, v, 2.

A *census* of the *population* was to be taken in Palestine as in "all the [Roman] world," but the Evangelist nowhere affirms or implies that the enrollment was to be conducted by any *Roman* officer, much less under the personal supervision of Quirinius. Luke simply employs the enrollment to give a general historical date to the Nativity: "When Quirinius was governor of Syria." Quirinius was a man of remarkable administrative and military abilities. He had subdued the hardy mountaineers of Cilicia, and had accorded to him the honors of a Roman triumph as a great general. Having now been engaged so successfully in military service in the East, he appears to have been appointed special commissioner to enroll the Jewish nation as the subjects of Cæsar's government when Jesus was born. Accordingly, he was known as "Governor of Syria,"³⁹ a term employed to express the title being very broad, and here understood in its broadest sense as including the commission extraordinary, as the *legatus* of Cæsar. Quirinius died in Rome, A. D. 21.

W. M. Ramsay, who is one of the latest authorities on the historical New Testament, observes:

"The decree of Augustus which Luke mentions is commonly interpreted as ordering that a single census should be held of the whole Roman world. This is not a correct interpretation of Luke's words. He uses the *present tense*, and he means that Augustus ordered enrollments to be regularly taken, according to the strict and proper usage of the present tense. What Augustus did was to lay down the principle of systematic enrollment in the Roman world, not to arrange for the taking of one single census."⁴⁰

While, in compliance with imperial requirement, this was to be a Roman registration, it was to be conducted distinctly by the Jewish method. It was a reservation made in the original compact when the Jews became a dependency on the empire, that they were to exercise the sovereign right to manage their internal affairs in ac-

³⁹ Ἡγεμῶν, leader, guide, prefect, president, governor of a Roman province.

⁴⁰ "Was Christ born in Bethlehem?" c. vi, 123, 124.

cordance with their own laws and religion.⁴¹ It is easy to see, therefore, why every person was expected to register in his own tribal territory, and in his own native city.

“Owing to the care with which the Jews preserved their family records and pedigrees, all true Jews would know what was their family and their proper city according to the ancient tribal system, even though they might have been forced by circumstances to change their abode. This seems to have suggested the mode of enrollment which Luke describes—a mode which would mark off, by a broad clear line, the true Jews from the mongrel population of Palestine. All who claimed to be Jews were to repair to the proper city of their tribe and family. The rest of the population, who were probably much more numerous, would be counted according to their ordinary residence.”⁴²

On this point Dr. Edersheim remarks:

“In consequence of the decree of Cæsar Augustus, Herod directed a general registration to be made after the Jewish rather than the Roman manner. . . . All country people were to be registered in their own city, meaning thereby the town to which the village or place where they were born was attached. In so doing, ‘the house or lineage’ was marked. According to the Jewish mode of registration, the people would have to be enrolled according to their tribes, families, or clans, and the house of their fathers. . . . In the case of Joseph and Mary, whose descent from David was not only known, but where, for the sake of the unborn Messiah, it was most important that this should be distinctly noted, it is natural that, in accordance with Jewish law, they should go to Bethlehem.”⁴³

Among the last words which are most valuable touching this enrollment at the time of the Nativity, is that given by the eminent Augustus W. Zumpt, a nephew of the § 51. Zumpt's celebrated classical scholar of the same name, Researches. himself a superior classical scholar, and one of the most distinguished archæologists of this or any other age, who is a resident of Berlin. His researches have attracted profound attention and approval from men of critical scholarship and learning on this subject. Schaff cites Zumpt as claiming “that there is nothing in Luke’s account which does not receive from modern research *full historical probability*.”⁴⁴ His conclusion

⁴¹ Joseph. *Ant.* xvi, 2, 3; *Wars*, VI, 6, 2.

⁴³ *Jesus the Messiah*, I, 182, 183.

⁴² *Christ born at Beth.* 188.

⁴⁴ Schaff, *Ch. Hist.* I, 125, n. 3.

that the date of the birth of Christ occurred at the time of the taking of the census (B. C. 4) by Quirinius is indorsed by the scholarly Mommsen, and accords with the views of Ideler, Bergmann, Browne, Ussher, and Sanclemente, as also with those of Borghesi, De Rossi, Ramsay, and Schaff. In brief, Zumpt concludes that Saturninus was governor of Syria in B. C. 9-6, Varus 6-4, and Quirinius 4-1 A. D., and again 6-11, corrected chronology.⁴⁵

A question of vital interest historically has been discussed of recent years: How could Quirinius have ordered an enrollment of the Jews in Palestine in B. C. 4, when it is a known fact that he was appointed governor of Syria and made a registration there ten years later, in A. D. 6 corrected chronology? The complete answer is, that Quirinius was appointed to that office *twice*. His first appointment was in B. C. 4, and his second in A. D. 6. In the first instance his function was to take a *census* of the *Jewish population*; in the second, it was a *registration* of the *Jews' property*, for the purpose of taxation. Under Pompey (B. C. 63) the Jewish nation had been reduced to a dependency upon the Roman Empire, and paid a certain tribute to the imperial power. It was now contemplated to replace the *produce-tribute* due Rome by an individual *head-tax* imposed upon every man and woman in the nation between the ages of fourteen and sixty-five. The census, however, was taken under the management of several governors in succession. It was begun under Sentius Saturninus, and continued under Quintilius Varus, and completed under Publius Sulpicius Quirinius, as already stated.

In this connection it should be noted that this was not merely a local tax of the Jews in Palestine: it was a universal taxation extending to all the nations and dependencies embraced within the Roman Empire; for Augustus is said to

⁴⁵ That is, Saturninus was governor A. U. 746-748, Varus 748-750, Quirinius 750-753, and again 760-765.

have adopted the policy of gathering the statistics of his imperial resources by means of agents employed throughout the empire, which he himself tabulated for ready reference. These tabulations were of two classes; the first being "a sort of balance sheet published periodically" for the information of the people;⁴⁶ the second, a kind of compendium summing up the dependencies, kingdoms, countries, and allies, to indicate the resource and military power of the Roman Empire.⁴⁷ These celebrated tables of statistics are said to have been read in the Roman Senate on the occasion of the emperor's death.⁴⁸

Now, it is quite obvious that Luke, with that historical instinct which characterizes his authorship throughout, makes distinct reference to both enrollments in a manner indicating a perfect understanding of the situation on his own part, and on that of his contemporaries whom he addresses. He refers to the first enrollment as a principal fact concurrent with the Nativity of Jesus, and he alludes to the second *incidentally* in narrating what Gamaliel said before the Jewish Sanhedrin in the defense of the apostles. In recounting the different rebellions in Palestine against the Roman power, Gamaliel recalled, "After this man [Theudas], rose up Judas of Galilee *in the days of the enrollment.*"⁴⁹ In the absence of any explanation, these two references indicate that the Evangelist knew that he was perfectly secure of his ground in respect to both, and that the two enrollments were entirely familiar facts to his contemporaries. For he obviously wrote for those then living, not for those coming two thousand years afterwards. Those whom he addressed needed no explanations, and he offered none.

§ 53. Luke
notes both
Enrollments.

The second governorship and enrollment were much the more important of the two. The appointment of Quirinius thereto was probably due in a large measure to his former rule as governor, and his superior tact and management of the

⁴⁶ *Rationes imperii.* ⁴⁷ *Breviarium totius imperii.* ⁴⁸ Suetonius, *Augustus*, 28, 101; Tacitus, *Annals*, I, 11; Dion Cassius, III, 30; Ivi, 33. ⁴⁹ Acts v, 37.

people in taking the census previously. The imposition of the imperial tax had always involved much delicacy on the part of the government of Syria, owing to the extreme sensitiveness of the Jews on that subject. The supreme thing in the mind of Augustus was that order and quiet should be preserved among the people in the dependencies of the empire. How difficult and delicate the duties imposed on Quirinius in enrolling the property of the Jews for taxation are evident from the fact that the attempts afterward to carry out the imperial requirement were met with vigorous resistance, and finally issued in an open rebellion and war against the Romans, which terminated in the complete overthrow and extermination of the Jewish nationality.

§ 54. Historical Accounts. Dr. Philip Schaff cites with approval several high authorities as having an important bearing upon this historical question.⁵⁰ He says:

“Cassiodorus⁵¹ and Suidas⁵² expressly assert the fact of a general census, and add several particulars which are not derived from Luke; *e. g.*, Suidas says that Augustus elected twenty commissioners of high character, and sent them to all parts of the empire to collect statistics of the population as well as of property, and to return a portion to the national treasury. Hence Huschke, Wieseler, Zumpt, Plumptre, and McClellan accept their testimony as historically correct. . . . Wieseler quotes also John Malala, the historian of Antioch, as saying, probably on earlier authorities, that ‘Augustus in the thirty-ninth year and tenth month of his reign [*i. e.*, B. C. 5 or 6], issued a decree for a general registration throughout the empire.’ Julius Cæsar had begun a measurement of the whole empire, and Augustus completed it.”

CONFIRMATIONS BY ENEMIES.

Josephus does not notice the *first* governorship of Quirinius in Syria, and his taking the *census* of the population of the Jews concurrently with the birth of Jesus. Silence in a writer of a given fact, however, can not be legitimately construed as evidence that it never occurred. Silence neither proves nor disproves any circumstance.

§ 55. Testimony of Josephus.

⁵⁰ *Hist. Church*, I, 124, 125, n. 4.

⁵¹ *Variarum*, iii, 52.

⁵² *Ἀπογραφὴ*, written about A. D. 19.

No historian records every event of a given time, especially such as does not come within the scope of his work. Josephus was not writing a history of the Roman Empire, much less of the origin of Christianity, that he should have referred to the census or to Christ's birth. The first administration of Quirinius was, in fact, merely preparatory for the second, and bore no comparison with it in importance and results. A mere census-taking was a very harmless matter in itself; but the inauguration of an imperial tax upon every man and woman in the nation was most offensive to the susceptibilities of the Jews.

The second administration of Quirinius in Syria and Palestine immediately succeeded the deposing of Archelaus from his ethnarchy of Judæa when his territory became a Roman province under the government of Syria. In reference to Quirinius's second governorship, Luke cites briefly the speech of Gamaliel before the Sanhedrin thus: "After this man [Theudas], rose up Judas of Galilee, *in the days of the taxing*, and drew away much people after him. He also perished, and as many as followed him were dispersed.⁵³ Josephus refers to the conduct of both Theudas and Judas of Galilee by name.⁵⁴ His testimony is:

"Now Quirinius, a Roman Senator, and one who had gone through other magistracies, and had passed through them till he had been made consul, . . . was of great dignity, . . . being sent by [Gaius] Cæsar to be judge of the nation, *and to take an account of their substance*. . . . There was one Judas, a Gaulonite, of a city whose name was Gamala, who, taking with him Sadduc, a Pharisee, became zealous to draw them to a revolt, who both said that this taxation was no better than an introduction to slavery, and exhorted their nation to assert their liberty."⁵⁵

Why Josephus mentions this "Judas, a Gaulonite of Gamala," and elsewhere in four instances, and in both histories, calls him "Judas of Galilee," is not known. Perhaps he was born in Galilee, and afterward resided in Gamala—as Jesus was called a Galilean,⁵⁶ though he was born in Judæa. Jose-

⁵³Acts v, 37.⁵⁴Anl. xx, 5, 1, 2.⁵⁵Ib. xviii, 1, 1.⁵⁶Matt. ii, 23.

phus mentions him as the author of a certain philosophy⁵⁷ among the Jews; in noting that "the two sons of Judas of Galilee were slain: I mean that Judas who caused the people to revolt when Quirinius came to take an account of the estates of the Jews;"⁵⁸ "when Archelaus's part of Judæa was reduced to a province . . . a certain Galilean, whose name was Judas, prevailed with his countrymen to revolt, and said that they were cowards if they would endure to pay a tax to the Romans."⁵⁹ "In the meantime one Mănăhem, the son of Judas that was called a Galilean, who . . . had formerly reproached the Jews under Quirinius, that after God, they were subject to the Romans."⁶⁰

The witness of the Emperor Julian touching Quirinius is here in place. Having in his command all the archives of the empire, he is conscious of the absolute certainty of his knowledge and resources in the case, and assumes a defiant tone against the Christians respecting Joseph and Mary being at Bethlehem at the time that Quirinius was enrolling the Jews. He says:

§ 56. Testi-
mony of
Julian.

"Jesus whom you celebrate was one of Cæsar's subjects. If you dispute it I will prove it by and by; but it may as well be done now. For yourselves, allow that he was enrolled with his father and mother in the time of Quirinius." "But Jesus having persuaded a few among you, and those the worst of men, has now been celebrated about three hundred years, having done nothing in his lifetime worthy of remembrance—unless one thinks it a mighty matter to heal lame and blind people, and exorcise demoniacs in the villages of Bethsaida and Bethany."⁶¹

Here are three distinct implications which should not pass unnoticed:

(1.) That Julian stood prepared to prove his statement, if the Christians disputed it.

(2.) That Jesus was enrolled with his father and mother in the time of Quirinius.

(3.) That the Christians themselves knew and allowed his proposition to be true.

⁵⁷*Ant.* xviii, 1, 6.

⁵⁸*Ib.* xx, 5, 2.

⁵⁹*Wars*, ii, 8, 1.

⁶⁰*Ib.* ii, 17, 8.

⁶¹Cyril, cited in Lardner's Works, VII, 626, 627.

Certainly there was no other time than this when Jesus could have been "enrolled as one of Cæsar's subjects" "in the time of Quirinius." The witness of these adversaries of Christianity may now receive confirmation from

§ 57. Patristic Testimony.

a) Justin Martyr, who was a native Syrian and wrote about the middle of the second century, addressed the emperor, the Cæsars, the Senate, and the people of Rome, appealing to the enrollment of Quirinius then in the governmental archives in their possession. He says:

"Now there is a village in the land of the Jews, thirty-five stadia from Jerusalem, in which Jesus Christ was born, as you can ascertain also from the registers of the taxing under Quirinius, your first procurator in Judæa."⁶²

β) Quintus S. F. Tertullian, the Father of Latin Theology, born in Carthage, Africa, was eminent in the profession of law. He was a man distinguished for his learning and eloquence. Writing with a different purpose and from a different country, he refers to the same enrollment and the same period, mentioning Saturninus under whom the Palestinian enrollment was *begun*, and afterward completed by Quirinius. He says:

"There is historical proof that at this very time a census had been taken in Judæa by Sentius Saturninus which might have satisfied their inquiry respecting the family and descent of Christ."⁶³ Francisus Junius is quoted as authority for the historical statement that "the agent through whom Saturninus carried out the Census in Judæa was the governor Quirinius, according to Luke ii."

γ) Clement of Alexandria, a native of Athens, who was eminent for his talents and learning of the Christians, wrote about the same time as Tertullian, near the close of the second century. He says: "*Our Lord was born in the twenty-eighth year when first the enrollment was ordered to be taken, in the reign of Augustus.*"⁶⁴

⁶² *First Apology*, c. 34.

⁶³ Marcion, iv, c. 19, and note 8.

⁶⁴ Ὅτε πρῶτον ἐκέλευσαν ἀπογραφὰν γενέσθαι, *Strom.* Bk. i, c. 21.

RECORROBORATIONS.

a) A fragment of an inscription recording the honors of a Roman officer named Q. Æmilius Secundus, who rendered distinguished service under Quirinius when he was governor of Syria, was by Mommsen and other high authorities condemned as a modern forgery and fraud, perpetrated to give some support to Luke's statement, because it mentioned the census taken by Quirinius. But recently the lost half of the stone was discovered in the demolition of a building in Venice, Italy, and the recovery justified the inscription as both ancient and genuine. It represents that,

§ 58. Monumental Testimony.

“By the orders of Quirinius, he made the census of the population of Apamea [a district in Syria], enumerating 117,000 citizens. The emphasis laid on the number suggests that the numbering of the total population was the chief object of the Apamean census. . . . The inscription leaves it uncertain whether the Apamean numbering occurred in the first or second administration of Syria by Quirinius.”

He is called Cæsar's *legate* of Syria.⁶⁵

β) A fragment of a marble slab was discovered in 1764, near Tibur (Tivoli), bearing an inscription related to early Christianity, which is now in the custody of the Lateran Museum of Christian Antiquities. It is a record in honor of a Roman officer during the reign of Augustus. He was the conqueror of a nation, and for his military successes he was honored at Rome with *two thanksgivings made to the gods*;⁶⁶ honors representing a general in war, clad in magnificent robes, bearing his ivory scepter, borne in his triumphal chariot, etc. He had been proconsul of Asia, and, as a legate of Augustus, was governor of Syria *twice*. The name is obliterated, but the case fits no other conqueror of the period than Quirinius, with respect to whom, however, the fitness is so exactly complete that the consensus of the best authorities, such as Mommsen, Borghesi, De Rossi, Henzen, Dessau, and

⁶⁵ Ramsay, *Christ Born at Beth.*, 150, 151, 168, 240, 241.

⁶⁶ *Supplicationes*, Ramsay, 231.

others, assigns this monscription to Publius Sulpicius Quirinius, governor of Syria twice.⁶⁷

γ) This twofold legation is founded upon the statement of Tacitus, which is confirmed by monumental testimony unearthed between the villa Hadriani and the Via Tiburtina at Rome. Here again the inscription is nameless, and some other parts are lost. The circumstance known, however, adapt themselves to no other than Quirinius, in the judgment of Bergmann, Mommsen, Merivale, Zumpt, and others. Supplying the missing parts, the inscription then would read: "*Quirinius as proconsul obtained Asia as a province. As Legate of the deified Augustus, a second time, he governed Syria and Phœnicia.*"⁶⁸

Besides these, there are three instances of enrollments recorded upon the monument of Ancyra, dating respectively A. U. 726, 748, 767. "Tertullian, who was a learned lawyer, speaks of one in Judæa under Sentius Saturninus A. U. 749; and this would be the one which must be meant by Luke."⁶⁹

§ 59. Summary of the Evidence.

How, then, does the case stand? The several circumstances concurrent with the Nativity and infancy of Jesus, as narrated by the Evangelist, are ten in number. These are, the appearance of a strange star, the visit of the Magi, their worship of the Child Jesus, Joseph warned to flee the country, Joseph's flight into Egypt, Herod's massacre of the children, his motive for this procedure, the death of King Herod, the return of Joseph and his family, and the enrollment of Quirinius. Of these, seven have been substantiated by the testimony of the arch-enemy Celsus. Three or four of these have demanded special discussion as principal facts, viz.:

- (1) The Magi and the Star of the East.
- (2) The Death of Herod the Great.
- (3) The Enrollment under Quirinius.

⁶⁷ Ramsay, *Christ Born*, etc., c. xi, 227, 228.

⁶⁸ . . . PRO. CONSUL. ASIAM. PROVINCIAM. OP[TINUIT LEGATUS]. DIVI. AUGUSTI. [I]TERUM [i. e., the second time] SYRIAM. ET. PH[œNICIEM] ADMINISTRAVIT [or OBTINUIT]. See Schaaf, *Ch. Hist.* I, 123, note 1.

⁶⁹ Schaaf, *Hist.* I, 124, note 1.

α) Matthew's account of the Magi and their mysterious guide in the Star of the East finds support in many traditions of different lands and peoples. These are interesting, and are given for all they are worth. If they be set aside *because they are traditions*, their origin without an historical basis should be satisfactorily accounted for. Nevertheless, the main support of the argument related to the star is *rabbinical testimony*, found in the Talmud as explanatory of certain Messianic passages which affirm that the Messiah's advent *was to be signalized by a star*. Hence, too, the measure of success which accompanied the impostor *Bar-Kokheba*, "the Son of a Star," who, claiming to be the Messiah, struck coin with the image of a star. These evidences are confirmed by *patristic testimony*; that of Irenæus, Justin, and Tertullian. A further confirmation respecting the star of the Magi is founded upon the *astronomical discovery* of the conjunction of the planets, so satisfactory to the minds of the great astronomers, Kepler, Schubert, Pritchard, Encke, Pingré, and others.

β) A second principal fact looking to the date of the Nativity is also of a scientific character based upon astronomy, in the moon's eclipse, which Josephus says occurred on or near "that very night when King Herod died." This was on March 13, A. U. 750, or B. C. 4. As Herod was alive and sought the young Child's life in the massacre of the children, it is quite probable that the king died within the first year after Christ's birth, if not indeed within a few months of the Nativity.

γ) Finally, the last principal fact furnishing the basis of an argument respecting the time of Christ's birth is the *enrollment of Quirinius* as mentioned by Luke. The *requirement* of the census was of the Romans; the *method* of its execution was that of the Jews. This arrangement brought Joseph and Mary to the territory of Judah, and to the city of David, where Jesus was born in exact accordance with the prediction of prophecy.

That Quirinius was *twice* appointed governor of Syria is referred to by Luke; is substantiated by Cassiodorus, the Latin historian, and by Suidas, the lexicographer and geographer, who attest that some twenty honorable commissioners were sent by the emperor throughout the empire to collect statistics of the population and property. John Malala, the historian of Antioch, testifies distinctly that Augustus issued his imperial decree for a general registration of the empire as early as B. C. 5 or 6; that Julius Cæsar began the measurement of the whole empire, and Augustus completed it.

In this connection much emphasis is laid upon the testimony of the Emperor Julian, who affirms in absolute terms that Joseph and Mary, with Jesus, were registered under Quirinius, as the Christians themselves acknowledged, when Jesus became "one of Cæsar's subjects." Christ also confirmed the same when afterwards in his ministry he taught his enemies, "Render unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's, and unto God the things which are God's." The occurrence of the enrollment at that time is amply confirmed by the testimony of Justin and Tertullian, both of whom appeal to the Roman records in the archives of the government at Rome for the verification of their statements; and the same fact of the census is assumed in the testimony of Clement of Alexandria.

Further, the vindication of Luke's statement of the census-taking by Quirinius at the time when Christ was born, is found in three or four *monumental inscriptions* of recent discovery which give honor to Quirinius, or verify his enrollment of the Jews B. C. 4.

The fact of the conjunction of the planets Jupiter, Saturn, and Mars, supplemented by a comet, as determined by Wieseler in A. U. 750, with that of the moon's eclipse on the night near to Herod's death in 750, and the enrollment of Quirinius in the same year, constitute in combination a powerful argument that the historical event that Jesus was born B. C. 4 took place according to our current chronology.

CHAPTER IV.

UNIQUE PLACE OF JOHN THE BAPTIST IN
HISTORY.

- I. JOHN'S CHARACTER AND MISSION.
- II. THE CHRONOLOGY OF HIS WORK.
- III. HIS IMPRISONMENT AND DEATH.
- IV. THE RELATION OF HIS WORK TO JESUS.

CHAPTER IV.

HISTORICAL PLACE OF JOHN THE BAPTIST.

§ 60. Sources: Biographical Epitomes, and Literature.

1. EUSEBIUS PAMPHILIUS (b. 265—d. 340) was a native of Palestine, and became Bishop of Cæsarea 315, when he wrote his *Ecclesiastical History*. Upon the martyrdom of his eminent teacher in the Theological School at Cæsarea, named Pamphilius, Eusebius assumed his name in loving remembrance of him. He was a man of great abilities, and the *confidante* of the Emperor Constantine the Great, who requested Eusebius to open the proceedings of the Council of Nicæa in 325 with an oration, and assigned him the place of imperial honor at his own right hand during its sessions. Dean Stanley mentions Eusebius as at once “the clerk of the imperial closet, the interpreter, the chaplain, and the confessor of Constantine.”

Eusebius published more than thirty different literary works, critical, historical, exegetical, doctrinal, and apologetic. Besides this broad authorship, he continued in the exercise of the functions of orator, minister, and bishop. His pre-eminence is indicated in that he is called “*the Father of Church History, the Christian Herodotus,*” and is the recognized founder of the school of Ecclesiastical Historians whose work continued down through several centuries. “All Greek authors of the fourth century who undertook to write the history of the Church, began where Eusebius ended, as having nothing considerable to add to his labor.” (Tillemont.) He wrote in Greek, and “his Church History and Chronicle will always remain an invaluable collection of information not attainable in any other eminent author.” (Schaff.) “Eusebius seems to have been very disinterested, very sincere, and a great lover of peace, of truth, and religion.” (Du Pin.) “Beyond question the most learned and most famous of living writers at that time.” (Lightfoot.) “Of all his works, the *Ecclesiastical History* is the most invaluable.” (Lardner.) “Eusebius, to whose zeal we owe most of what is known of the history of the New Testament . . . quotes the Gospels eighteen times.” (Westcott.)

2. **DION CASSIUS** (b. 155) was a native of Nicæa, Bithynia, in Asia Minor. He went to Rome and became a senator in the reign or soon after the death of Aurelius (161-180). He was made consul the second time under the reign of Alexander Severus (222-235), but died soon after. He wrote Roman history in the Greek language, in which eighty books were written in decades, of which only eighteen or nineteen books have been preserved in their entirety. He gives an account of events from the landing of Æneas in Italy down to A. D. 229. He is generally esteemed as an eminent historian, who was careful in research, exact in dates, and pre-eminent for his elegance of style. "The various important offices which he held under the emperors gave him valuable opportunities for historical investigation." (*Encyc. Brit.*) An abridged translation by J. Xiphilin appeared in London, 1704. The natural sympathy which Dion Cassius felt for the government which had intrusted him with these several offices, and access given him to the contents of its archives for materials to write its history, sufficiently justify the belief that Dion Cassius must be classed with the adversaries of the Christian religion, or he would not have been loyal to the Roman Empire.

3. **DAVID F. STRAUSS** was a German skeptic, born at Württemberg in 1808, and died of cancer in his native place on February 9, 1874. He studied at Tübingen under F. C. Baur, the famous adversary of Christianity, pursuing both a classical and theological course. In 1835, when twenty-seven, he published his *Life of Christ*. He attempted to account for Christianity on the basis of a Mythical Theory, and in the Preface of his work he insisted that miracle, prophecy, or indeed anything called supernatural, can not be, and is unhistorical. Nevertheless, he admits that "Christianity is a moral and spiritual power in the earth;" that "we can not do without it, nor can it be lost;" that "Jesus stands foremost among those who have given a higher ideal to humanity." However, Strauss absolutely fails to account for all this power when he holds for the ideal, but not as an historical religion. He does not explain how it is that mere myths should have become "a moral and spiritual power in the earth;" and be of such character that "we can not do without it, nor can it be lost!" Are myths a necessity to humanity? Historical criticism so destroyed Strauss's "Mythical Theory" of the Gospels that he felt constrained in 1864 to rewrite his *Life of Jesus*. It made but little impression on the world, however. In his last work, entitled *The Old Faith and the New*, he repudiates his former estimate of Christ's character as a religious genius, holding that his chief characteristic was "fantastic fanaticism," and his resurrection from the dead "a world-wide humbug." He denied immortality. Truly he began as an idealist, and ended a materialist.

§ 61. Place of John the Baptist in History.

Ἡ ἀγία τῶν εὐαγγελίων τετρακτύς—“*The Holy Quaternion of the Gospels.*—EUSEBIUS.

The beginning of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God.—MARK.

There came a man sent from God whose name was John; the same came for witness that he might bear witness of the Light. . . . He was a burning and a shining light.—JOHN.

Verily I say unto you, Among them that are born of women, there hath not arisen a greater than JOHN THE BAPTIST.—JESUS.

ARGUMENT.

The ancient adversaries of Christianity in their writings have much to say of the noble and devout character of John the Baptist, but are almost silent touching the supreme character of JESUS, THE CHRIST OF GOD. Nevertheless, what they say of the Baptist accords well with the statements of the Gospels, and furnishes this added interest, that they supplement certain details which are omitted by the Evangelists, pertaining to the close of John's life. In their cognition of the Baptist's character and ministry they furnish a connecting link with THE CHRIST OF HISTORY, and so far verify the antiquity and authenticity of the New Testament.

The relation of John the Baptist to the person and Gospel of Jesus Christ is highly important in this historical inquiry. John's whole public service was of a character to prepare the people and to introduce with his witness the Christ of the Scriptures; and accordingly John's ministry in history derives its significance from his relation to the person and work of Jesus Christ. It was the express function of the Baptist to be the announcer to the world of the Christ who was to follow, and of his kingdom then at hand, calling upon the people to repent and be baptized unto a better life. By the rite of John's baptism the Lord Jesus was inaugurated into his Messianic ministry, when it was revealed from heaven by Another Witness that JESUS WAS THE SON OF GOD. This work accomplished, John disappears from the page of history.

1. Character and Ministry of John.
2. The Chronology of John's Work.
3. Imprisonment and Death of John.
4. Relation of his Ministry to Jesus.

a) JOHN'S SANCTITY AND WORK.

All four Evangelists record briefly the historical existence of this last prophet of Israel, the famous announcer of Christ and his kingdom. The first two Gospels declare substantially

the same facts with some variety of expression, indicating
 § 62. The Gos- at once the function of the Baptist's preach-
 pels and the ing, and his marvelous influence and power
 Baptist. with the people:

"In those days cometh John the Baptist preaching in the wilderness of Judæa, saying, Repent ye, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand. For this is he that was spoken of by Isaiah the prophet saying,

The voice of one crying in the wilderness,
 Make ye ready the way of the Lord;
 Make his paths straight.

Then went out to him Jerusalem, and all Judæa, and all the region round about Jordan, and they were all baptized of him in the river Jordan, confessing their sins."¹

Luke opens his Gospel with an account of John's birth, and Mark with an account of his public life. After a few sentences in the opening of the fourth Gospel, John introduces the Baptist with the special remark, "There came a man sent from God, whose name was John;"² and Mark adds that "Herod feared John, knowing that he was a righteous and holy man."³ In respect to John's ministry Luke recalls the prophecy of his father Zacharias over his infant child, "Thou, child, shalt be called the prophet of the Most High." Then, passing over the long solitude and silence of his private life in the desert, he resumes at the beginning point of his public activities:

"The word of God came to John the son of Zacharias in the wilderness; and he came into all the region round about Jordan preaching the baptism of repentance unto the remission of sins. With many other exhortations therefore preached he good tidings unto the people."⁴

Eusebius transmits some interesting particulars which are helpful to a proper understanding of the purpose had by the Evangelists in opening their several Gospels with reference to the time of the Baptist's ministry. He says:

§ 63. Testi-
 mony of
 Eusebius.

"The apostle [John] in his Gospel gives the deeds of Jesus before the Baptist was cast into prison; but the other three Evangelists men-

¹Matt. iii, 1-3, 5; comp. Mark 1, 2-5. ²John 1, 6. ³Mark vi, 20. ⁴Luke iii, 2, 3, 18.

tion the circumstances [occurring] after that event." "For it is evident that the other three Evangelists only wrote the deeds of our Lord for one year after the imprisonment of John the Baptist, and intimated that in the very beginning of their history."⁵

Josephus confirms the Evangelists in nearly every essential particular. He says:

"Now, some of the Jews thought that the destruction of Herod's army came from God, and that very justly, as a punishment for what he did against John that was called the Baptist. For Herod [Antipas] slew him who was a good man, and commanded §64. Josephus and the Baptist. the Jews to exercise virtue both as to righteousness toward one another and piety toward God, and so to come to his baptism, . . . supposing that the soul was thoroughly purified beforehand by righteousness. Now, when others came in crowds about him—for they were greatly moved by hearing his words—Herod feared lest the great influence of John which he had over the people might put it in his power and inclination to raise a rebellion, for they seemed ready to do anything he would advise,"⁶ etc.

The accordancy of Josephus's witness with the record of the Evangelists respecting the private character and public influence of the Baptist is complete in proving the main facts so far as stated in the Gospels to be historical. It leaves nothing more to be desired. The confirmation of Josephus is distinct and decisive on the following points:

1. He identifies by name and occupation the man known as "John who was called the Baptist."
2. He affirms his uprightness and religious character before the public: "He was a good man."
3. He commends his ministry: "Who commanded virtue toward men, and piety towards God."
4. He mentions John's religious function for a better life: that men "should come to his baptism."
5. He accredits him with great influence over men: "Herod feared the great influence of John."

β) CHRONOLOGY OF JOHN'S MINISTRY.

To complete the historicity of John's ministry, its chronology remains to be considered. In a manner §65. Luke's Chronology. very remarkable, but with characteristic exactness, Luke gives his chronological data in accordance with the

⁵ *Ecccl. Hist.* B. iiii, c. 24, p. 98, Bohn's ed.

⁶ *Antiq.* xviii, 5, 2.

usage of his age. In referring to the Baptist's life and work he mentions all the rulers of his period in Palestine, whether civil or ecclesiastical, whether imperial or local, together with their respective offices and realms. He specifies no distinct dates, which is a modern custom; but he designates by periods and rulers, which was the common ancient custom. Nothing could better prove that the writer of the third Gospel was a contemporary of the times in which he is commonly believed to have written than this method of indicating events by reigns and rulers; and nothing would sooner betray a later authorship of Luke's writings than the more modern mode of dating by the calendar. But without hesitation or explanation, and assuming it to be understood by his contemporaries and their successors as much as by himself, Luke gives a long list of officials, and their respective places, without a single mistake. He says:

"Now in the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius Cæsar, Pontius Pilate being governor of Judæa, and Herod [Antipas] being tetrarch of Galilee, and his brother Philip tetrarch of the region of Ituræa and Trachonitis, and Lysanias tetrarch of Abilene, in the high priesthood of Annas and Caiaphas, the Word of God came unto John, the son of Zacharias in the wilderness."⁷

Dr. David Friedrich Strauss, of Germany, the stalwart §66. Strauss's enemy of Christianity for the past century, Confirmation. affirms the absolute correctness of Luke's historical chronology. He says:

"Luke determines the date of John's appearance by various synchronisms, placing it in the time of Pilate's government in Judæa, in the sovereignty of Herod, of Philip and Lysanias over the divisions of Palestine, and in the high priesthood of Annas and Caiaphas, and moreover precisely in the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius, which, reckoning from the death of Augustus, corresponds with the year 28-29 of our era. *With this last and closest demarcation of time, all the foregoing less precise ones agree. Even that which makes Annas high priest together with Caiaphas appears correct if we consider the peculiar influence which that ex-high priest retained.*"⁸

⁷ Luke's Gospel, iii, 1, 2.

⁸ *Leben Jesu*, §44, pp. 300, 301.

There is further confirmation of this chronology given by the Latin historian of fame, Tacitus, a contemporary of Luke, who was writing upon the crucifixion of Jesus. Both John the Baptist and Jesus died within less than four years of this chronological *datum* of the beginning of John's ministry, and perhaps within two years of each other. No changes occurred among the rulers during this brief period. This same Herod Antipas of Galilee figures with his soldiers in mockery of Jesus before the crucifixion.⁹ Tacitus observes:

§ 67. Confirmation by Tacitus.

"Christ, the Founder of that name, was put to death as a criminal by Pontius Pilate, procurator of Judæa, in the reign of Tiberius [Cæsar]."¹⁰

Here again is entire agreement with Luke's chronology. Pilate ruled as procurator of Judæa, in behalf of the Roman Empire, for a single decade—viz., 26–36 A. D.—and Tiberius reigned as emperor for twenty-three years; viz., 14–37 A. D. Now, a twofold advantage arises in placing together, in comparison, the witness of Luke's chronology respecting the Baptist's ministry and that of Tacitus respecting Christ's crucifixion. First, it evidences the customary method of the writers of those times in indicating chronological *data* by definite periods falling within the reign of certain rulers; secondly, in proving the very historical identity of the rulers in power during John's ministry as well as that of Christ. Luke and Tacitus were contemporaries, writing of different persons, but citing the same rulers as in office at the same time. It would be difficult to find any historical proof more conclusive.

§ 68. Confirmation by Josephus.

To this may be added the testimony of Josephus as a third and independent witness, corroborative of Luke's statement of the local rulers, and their respective forms of government:

"While Herod and Philip had each of them received his own tetrarchy and settled the affairs thereof, . . . the other sons of Herod

⁹ Luke xxiii, 7–11.

¹⁰ *Annals*, xv, 44.

[the Great], Philip [II], and that Herod who was called Antipas, each of them took upon him the administration of their own tetrarchies." "Now, Pilate who was sent as procurator into Judæa by Tiberius,"¹¹ etc.

γ) JOHN'S IMPRISONMENT AND DEATH.

Attention may now be directed to the unrighteous imprisonment of this righteous man John, by Herod Antipas, the tetrarch of Galilee, by whose order he was finally executed in the prison. The several Gospels, taken in their order, record the special *occasion* of Herod's procedure against the Baptist.

Matthew says: "Herod had laid hold on John and bound him, and put him in prison for the sake of Herodias, his brother Philip's wife.

§69. John's Offense. For John said unto him [Herod], It is not lawful for thee to have her. And when he would have put him to death, he feared the multitude because they counted him as a

prophet. Now when he [Jesus] heard that John was delivered up, he withdrew into Galilee."¹² Mark mentions the same thing, adding of Herod that "he had married her."¹³ Luke says that "Herod the tetrarch, being reproved by him for Herodias his brother's wife, and for all the things which Herod had done, added yet this above all, that he shut up John in prison."¹⁴ The apostle John makes this brief reference: "For John was not yet cast into prison."¹⁵

§70. Josephus's Confirmation.

Josephus not only confirms the Evangelists as to the vile character of Herodias, but enlarges upon the intrigue of Herod with this woman, adding:

"But Herodias . . . was married to Herod [Philip I], the son of Herod the Great, who was born of Mariamne, the daughter of Simon the high priest, who had a daughter Salome, after whose birth Herodias took upon her to confound the laws of our country, and divorce herself from her husband while he was alive, and was married to Herod [Antipas], her husband's brother by the father's side. He was tetrarch of Galilee."¹⁶ "About this time Aretas [the King of Arabia Petræa] and Herod [Antipas] had a quarrel on the following account: Herod the tetrarch had married the daughter of Aretas, and had lived with her a great while. . . . However, he fell in love with Herodias, this last Herod [Philip's] wife," and intrigued to marry her which Herod Antipas finally accomplished. "One article of this marriage also was this, that he should divorce Aretas's daughter."^{*}

Josephus does not seem to have been aware of John's reproof administered to Herod Antipas, for which the tetrarch

**Ant.* xviii, 5, 1, 2; xvii, 10, 9.

¹¹*Ant.* xviii, 2, 1; *Wars*, ii, ix, 1, 2. ¹²*Matt.* xiv, 3-12; iv, 12. ¹³*Mark* vi, 17-20.

¹⁴*Luke* iii, 19, 20.

¹⁵*John* iii, 24.

¹⁶*Ant.* xviii, 5, 4; xviii, 7, 1.

imprisoned him. But this is not all. For some time after John was immured another event occurred, which was the immediate occasion of his death. It was a revengeful execution; and the only Evangelists who record the particulars are the first two. Matthew mentions that—

§ 71. Occasion
of His
Execution.

“When Herod’s birthday came, the daughter of Herodias danced in the midst, and pleased Herod; whereupon he promised with an oath to give her whatsoever she should ask. And she, being put forward by her mother, saith: Give me here in a platter the head of John the Baptist. And the king was grieved; but for the sake of his oaths and of them that sat at meat with him, he commanded it to be given; and he sent and beheaded John in prison. And his head was brought in a charger and given to the damsel; and she brought it to her mother. And his disciples came and took up the corpse and buried him; and they went and told Jesus.”¹⁷

Mark affirms the same facts, but gives these added particulars, viz.: that “Herodias set herself against him, and desired to kill him, but she could not; for Herod feared John, knowing that he was a righteous and holy man; but he kept him safe;” that the birthday celebration consisted of “a supper to his lords, and high captains, and the chief men of Galilee;” that “a soldier of the guard” was sent to behead him, and that Herod’s promise to the girl would comprise any gift she would ask, even “to the half of his kingdom.”¹⁸

These testimonies relating to Herod and Herodias, when analyzed and compared, yield the following facts:

§ 72. Testimo-
nies Com-
pared.

1. Herod Antipas was previously married to the daughter of King Aretas of Petræa. So affirms Josephus; but the Evangelists are silent on that subject.
2. Matthew and Mark mention a daughter of Herodias who danced on Herod’s birthday. Josephus mentions her as Herod Philip’s daughter, whose name was Salome.
3. Mark assumes as a fact that Philip was alive when Antipas married Herodias. Josephus affirms that she “divorced herself from her husband [Philip] while he was alive.”
4. Three Evangelists record John’s reproof of Herod, that his marrying Herodias was unlawful. Josephus alleges that Herodias’s second marriage “confounded the Jewish laws.”

¹⁷ Matt. xiv, 6-12. ¹⁸ Mark vi, 19-29.

It is evident that the Evangelists, with each other, and all with Josephus, are in such complete accord that not a single point of discrepancy appears, each one writing independently. At some points Josephus supplements what the Evangelists naturally omit as remote from their own particular line of historical narration. And all evince an accurate knowledge of public affairs which they undertake to record, even to the marital relations of the chief ruler of the realm. At all points the sacred writers are particularly without obscurity, without confusion, without mistake, albeit sometimes quite brief. And Josephus, writing apart from and independently of the Evangelists, more than corroborates them in that he gives added details of how Herod's marriage with Herodias came to pass; while the Evangelists relate only that which occurred after the wedding as its consequence. They mutually confirm; and both are historical.

It is something remarkable that the four Evangelists refer directly to the incarceration of the Baptist, but not one mentions the name or location of the prison. Its identity, however, has been conclusively determined by means of the details given by Josephus. Its modern Arabic name is *مكأور*,¹⁹ anciently known as *MACHÆRUS*, "a place on the borders of Aretas and Herod," "high in the mountain fastnesses of Peræa, on the east side of the Dead Sea," a few miles south of the northern extreme of that body of water. It is situate upon a lofty summit, surrounded by deep ravines on all sides, having by nature immense strength, and was originally intended to serve as a check upon the marauding tribes from Arabia, invading Palestine. It is not improbable that the banquet-hall in which Herod's birthday was celebrated was in the palace, quite near or immediately connected with this prison—the palace built and beautified by this tetrarch's father, Herod the Great. Josephus mentions

¹⁹ See Edersheim, *Life of Christ*, I, 659, 660; Tristram's *Moab*, 274-275; Baedeker, *Palestine*, ed. 1876, p. 303; and Josephus, *Wars*, vii, 6, 1.

“the royal palaces at Betharamptha, near the Jordan.”²⁰ Dr. Farrar describes the

“Palace-castle of Machærus on the eastern shore of the Dead Sea. It was built on the side of the ravine between Abarim and Pisgah, and not far from the baths of Calirrhoe. At this place he [Herod] and his courtiers, in soft clothing, would be near Ænon and other places where John baptized. . . . For Machærus, perched on the wild, precipitous rocks of the Zerka-ma-in, was inaccessible and impregnable, nor was there the least possibility that the prophet could ever be rescued by his followers from the rock-hewn dungeon beneath the splendid banquet-halls.” “In the same mountains in which Israel sought for the grave of her first prophet [Moses], was her last [prophet] entombed.”²¹

As to Herod’s purpose in this procedure against the Baptist, Josephus remarks:

“Herod . . . thought it best by putting him to death to prevent any mischief he might cause, and not bring himself into difficulties by sparing a man who might make him repent §74. Herod’s Motive. of it when it would be too late. Accordingly he [John] was sent a prisoner out of Herod’s suspicious temper to Machærus, . . . and was there put to death.”²²

There is no divergence in the narration of historical facts between the sacred writers and Josephus touching John’s imprisonment and execution; but there is a difference in the motive imputed to Herod for such procedure. Josephus refers Herod’s conduct to his extremely “suspicious temper” and fear of John’s influence over the people, which might result in rebellion, and so “thought it best to put him to death to prevent any mischief thereafter!” No overt act on John’s part is hinted; it was a mere matter of Herod’s suspicious disposition. Suspicion might possibly account for the arrest and incarceration of John, but it could not justify his execution. Besides, when the Baptist’s head was demanded by the women of his household, the tetrarch is said to have been “exceeding sorry:” “for Herod feared John, knowing that he was a just and holy man.”²³

²⁰ Τό Πλησιον Ἰορδάνου βασιλεία κατὰ Βαθαράμαθον; comp. Wars, ii, 4, 2, and vii, 6, 1, 2.

²¹ *The Herods*, 170, 172, 174.

²² *Ant.* xviii, 5, 1, 2.

²³ Mark vi, 20.

Upon the other hand, the Evangelists attribute the murder of John to the conspiracy of the two women, but especially to the malignant revenge sought and secured by the infamous Herodias because John had exercised the courage to confront the tetrarch and charge upon Herod and herself the guilt of illicit relations together. Herodias was a Jewess, who had "confounded the Jewish institutions," as Josephus puts it, by this bad conduct. Hence, "Herodias set herself against him, and desired to kill him, but she could not, for Herod . . . kept him safe." But she "nursed her wrath and kept it warm." But at the birthday festivities, when her daughter's graces had captivated Herod so that he swore to gratify her wish, even to the half of his realm, the mother saw her opportunity to avenge her hate, and instigated a demand for the head of the Baptist, to be delivered to her in a platter, and though Herod "was grieved" at such a request, and too proud of his word passed in the presence of his distinguished guests, he sent the ax-man, who brought and presented the ghastly gift to the women before them all, to grace the celebration of Herod's birthday! All this ingrained subtlety, so perfectly characteristic of a bad woman's revenge and a weak man's vacillation, carries its own conviction of truth to the mind.

Josephus obviously reflects the public opinion of the Jews, as he says, while the Evangelists furnish the internal and private history of the case, touching John's re-
§75. Herod's
Vacillation. proof, not known to the outer world. It is easy to understand how, at this time, the first Christians had special means of information, being in communication with John's disciples; for after John's burial his disciples "went and told Jesus." Meantime opposite and conflicting impulses affected Herod's mind, and occasioned his vacillation of conduct toward John at different times; for Mark relates that "Herod feared John; . . . and when he heard him he was much perplexed, and he heard him gladly." In the first instance, "the fear of John," whom he knew to be a good

man, added to the sting of his personal reproof and sense of guilt, *constrained* Herod to kill and silence him; but, on reflection, his "fear of the multitude," who believed in John, *restrained* him from doing it. However conflicting the opposite motives, they were not incompatible. For, as Strauss remarks: "Antipas might well fear that John, by his strong censure of the marriage, and the whole course of the tetrarch's life would stir up the people into a rebellion against him." At length he compromised the matter by arresting John, *to keep him safe in prison*. When, then, Herod's birthday had come around, his better judgment had somewhat assumed its sway, so that "the king was grieved" and "was exceeding sorry" when the surprising demand was made that John should be beheaded. However, all accounts attest that Herod did put John to death. Josephus does not contradict the Evangelists; the two motives assigned are not exclusive of each other in the case, but alternated powerfully in his consciousness.

It has been objected that the beheading of John, a prophet, by the king was too remarkable a transaction in high life to be historical. But this is mere sentiment, not ^{§76. SKEPTICAL} fact. It was certainly a remarkable occurrence, ^{OBJECTION.} but not therefore unhistorical. The account given of it by Josephus is even more marvelous than that of the Gospels. It can not be claimed that history furnishes no instance of decapitation in high life at that early period by such an order. Dion Cassius relates that, not remote from this period, Agrippina, the wife of Claudius and mother of Nero, dispatched an officer to behead Lollia Paulina, who had been her rival for imperial dignity. And when the head was brought to her, Agrippina failed to recognize the features; but, taking the head into her own hands for examination, she discovered a certain mark on her features which had specially distinguished her appearance in her lifetime.²⁴

²⁴ *Hist. of Rome*, B. 1x; 34.

δ) JOHN'S RELATION TO JESUS.

Josephus is careful to state that John the Baptist was a holy man, preached repentance unto the people, baptized unto the remission of sins, was imprisoned by Herod §77. Josephus and Antipas, and afterwards slain by his order; but Edersheim. he nowhere mentions the peculiar relation existing between Jesus and John respecting their work. Neither does he notice John's witness of Jesus, nor yet the testimony of Jesus respecting John. Edersheim expresses a conjectural opinion in explanation of these omissions. He says:

"Josephus always carefully suppresses, as far as possible, all that refers to Christ—probably not only in accordance with his own religious views, but because mention of a Christ might be dangerous, certainly would have been inconvenient in a work written by an intense self-seeker, mainly for readers at Rome."²⁵

Upon the other hand, Celsus admits the baptism of Jesus, which is the main fact in the case, and assails merely the accompanying circumstances as being incredible; §78. John and Celsus. viz., the appearance of the dove, and the voice from heaven. It is, however, merely his disbelief which he would oppose to the sacred record as a refutation of these circumstances external to the baptism itself. Now, unto the multitudes of people John's baptism was the sign of confession of sin and repentance unto a better life; but unto Jesus, "who knew no sin," the rite was appropriated to signalize before mankind Christ's induction unto his Messianic ministry of salvation unto men. So John himself testifies:

"On the morrow he [John] seeth Jesus coming unto him, and saith, Behold the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world. This is He of whom I said, After me cometh a man which is become before me, for he was before me. And I knew him not, but that he should be made manifest to Israel, for this cause came I baptizing with water. And John bare witness saying, I have beheld the Spirit descending as a dove out of heaven; and it abode upon him. And I knew him not, but he that sent me to baptize with water, he said unto me, Upon whomsoever

²⁵ *Life of Jesus*, I, 215.

thou shalt see the Spirit descending and abiding upon him, the same is he that baptizeth with the Holy Spirit. And I have seen and have borne witness that this is the Son of God.”²⁶

Celsus, however, assuming the fictitious character of a Jew addressing Jesus,

“Attacks the account of the appearance of the Holy Spirit in the form of a dove at the baptism.” “When you were bathing beside John, you say that what had the appearance of a bird from the air alighted upon you. . . . What credible witness beheld this appearance, or who heard a voice from heaven declaring you to be the Son of God?”²⁷

The relation of John and Jesus was something extraordinary, and without a parallel in history. It was not ecclesiastic in character, but religious, Messianic and redemptive. John was the connecting link between the two great dispensations of God with men. John’s history would indeed be weird if considered apart from the explanation given of his mission in the Gospel. But that furnished, harmonizes the whole account. It was his peculiar function to close the prophetism of the Old Testament, while he was yet preparing the way for the Gospel of the New Testament, which culminated in his rite inducting the Christ to his ministry and redeeming work. Jesus said of the Baptist:

“This is he of whom it is written, Behold I send my messenger before thy face who shall prepare the way before thee. Verily I say unto you, Among them that are born of women there hath not arisen a greater than John the Baptist. . . . For all the prophets and the law prophesied until John.”²⁸

His place on the historic page marks the transitional point in the economy of the two Testaments and completes their unity. His special mission was realized when it was illustrated in the three supreme acts of his ministry: his preparatory preaching of repentance, whereby he introduced the Christ to the apprehension of the world; his baptism of Jesus, whereby he inaugurated him to his saving offices of the world; and his

²⁶ John i, 29-34; comp. Matt. iii, 16, 17; Mark. i, 9-11; and Luke iv, 1.

²⁷ *Orig. contra Celsum*, i, 40, 41. ²⁸ Matt. xi, 10-13.

twice-attested witness, that Jesus was the very Lamb of God "which taketh away the sin of the world."²⁹

Many circumstances centering in John's personality and history served to intensify the interest of the multitudes in his mission. His birth as the subject of prophecy, the advent of an angel to announce the event, his being born of parents far advanced in years, his long silence in the solitudes of the wilderness, his strange appearance clad in "camel's hair, and a leathern girdle about his loins," who for food fed upon "locusts and wild honey," the earnest severity of his exactions in preaching, his insistence upon baptism as a public confession of piety, his stern courage in reproving sin in high places, his distinct witness that Jesus was the Messianic Redeemer from sin, his beautiful grace in retiring from the Christly Presence,* the abrupt termination of his work so soon after Christ had appeared,—these and other considerations doubtlessly deepened the impression which the Baptist made upon the multitudes and community at large who listened to his public utterances when he exclaimed: "I am the voice of one crying in the wilderness, Make straight the way of the Lord, as saith Isaiah the prophet."³⁰ "What wonder that such preaching opened countless hearts for that of the gospel of the kingdom of Jesus and his apostles!"³¹

§ 81. CONFIRMATIONS BY CHRISTIAN WRITERS.

As exhibiting the history of the faith based upon the fact of John's life-work, brief references will be sufficient.

α) Justin Martyr (145-150): "If John came first calling on men to repent while he still sat by the river Jordan, and Christ having come put an end to his prophesying and baptizing, and preaching also himself, saying, The kingdom of heaven is at hand." "The law and the prophets were until John the Baptist."³²

β) Clement of Alexandria (190-200): "Who, then, is John? . . . John is the Forerunner and that Voice, the Precursor of the Word; an inviting Voice preparing for salvation, . . . and this Voice was also the Precursor of the Lord's preaching glad tidings."³³

* "He must increase, but I must decrease." (John iii, 30.)

²⁹ John i, 29, 36.

³⁰ John i, 23; Isa. xl, 3.

³¹ Van Oosterzee.

³² *Dialogue with Trypho*, c. 51.

³³ *Exhortation to the Heathen*, c. 1.

γ) Tertullian (200): "Inasmuch as John is shown to be both the Forerunner and the Preparer of the ways of the Lord, who was to introduce the gospel and publish the kingdom of God, it follows, from the very fact that John has come, that Christ must be that very Being who was to follow his Harbinger John."³⁴

δ) Origen (245): "Let us, therefore, notice what he [Celsus] has to say by way of impugning the bodily appearance of the Holy Spirit to our Savior in the form of a dove." "I would like to say to Celsus, who represents a Jew as accepting somehow John as a Baptist, who baptized Jesus, that the existence of John the Baptist baptizing for the remission of sins is related by one who lived no great length of time after John and Jesus; for in the Eighteenth Book of his *Antiquities of the Jews*, Josephus bears witness to John as having been a Baptist, and as promising purification to those who underwent the rite," etc.³⁵

§ 82. RECORROBORATIONS IN CHRISTIAN ART.

As the ministry of John culminated in that of Jesus, so the real point of contact and unity of their work is discoverable in John's baptism of Christ. It is natural, therefore, that this conception should illustrate itself, as it has actually done, in monumental frescos and mosaics in Christian Art.

α) Among the very earliest known are two; the one found upon the wall and another in the sleeping room of a crypt of Santa Lucina, in the Catacombs of San Calisto at Rome. The best archæologists do not question that both represent the closing scene of John in his baptism of Jesus, the historical circumstances of which are so vividly described in the Gospel of Matthew. The figure in each fresco represents a man in the act of stepping forth from the water of the river, which reaches to the knee; and as he emerges, he is met by the ministrant, who is clad in a tunic, and stands on the shore. In both figures the symbol of the Holy Spirit in the form of a dove, approaching in flight from behind the one baptized, may be seen bearing an olive branch in his beak. These frescos are obviously of the same age, and bear also to each other a striking resemblance. This difference occurs, however: the first figure of the person baptized is nude, while in the second it is draped from the waist; also in the second, there is added a pallium or a cloak in place of the mere tunic worn by the ministrant in the first figure.³⁶

β) Another representation in art of the same subject in *mosaics and frescos* was found in San Giovanni in fonte, Ravenna, dating about the middle of the fifth century. It is placed "in the crown of the dome." "Christ stands in the Jordan, whose waters reach above the middle of the body, while John, standing on the land and holding in his left hand

³⁴ *Adv. Marcion*, B. iv, c. 33.

³⁵ *Orig. contr. Cels.* 1, 41, 47.

³⁶ See Bennett's *Archæology*, pp. 396, 398, Figs. 126, 127, 128.

a jeweled cross, is pouring water upon the head of Christ from a shell in the Baptist's right hand. The symbolic dove descends directly upon the head of Jesus, and completes the baptismal representation."⁸⁷

γ) A fourth mosaic dating in the middle of the sixth century, was found in the Santa Maria, in Cosmedin, Ravenna. The appearance of Jesus is quite youthful, but the rough camel's-hair garment worn by John is plainly apparent. The subject of baptism is in water up to the waist, while the baptismal element is applied by the hand to the head; and the dove symbol is represented as in descent and in close proximity to the one baptized."⁸⁸

The evidence derived from Christian Art literature illustrates three important particulars relating to the history of Christianity, and to the Baptist's place in that history.

§83. The Evidence from Christian Art.

1. The unity of the fact of John's mission in distinction from the accretions of the ages required to enter into the mythical romances representative of unhistorical traditions.

2. The original transaction of the baptism of Jesus perpetuated by independent records by the evangelists, confirmed by Josephus and Celsus as independent proofs and continuously accepted by the Church as a capital fact connected with the origin of Christianity itself, and centering in the personality of Christ—constitute the best form of historical evidence.

3. The perpetuation of the baptismal event in Christian art in the early ages of Christian history places beyond contradiction the antiquity and authenticity of the Scriptures which record Christ's baptism as the initiative act to his ministry, and illustrate John's proper place in the historical world.

§ 84. SUMMARY.

That the Baptist was the contemporary of Jesus whom he baptized is affirmed by the Evangelists; that John was a man of noble virtues, whose preaching was open to the public, imposing "righteousness toward one another and piety towards God;" that he was imprisoned by Herod Antipas at Ma-

⁸⁷ Bennett's *Archæology*, p. 404, Fig. 132.

⁸⁸ *Ib.* p. 405, Fig. 133.

chærus, and by his order put to death, are so many facts attested by Josephus, the famous historian of the Jews. As to the antiquity of John's life, the destructive critic, Strauss, admits the absolute correctness of Luke's chronology. It was not, of course, the purpose or function of the enemies of Christianity to record John's special relation to Jesus; yet Celsus distinctly concedes and assumes that John did baptize the Lord, and even notes with a taunt the circumstance of the dove, the symbol of the Holy Spirit descending and abiding upon Jesus at his baptism. The baptismal rite itself could have no other characteristic or function than to inaugurate Christ's great ministry of teaching, self-manifestation, and redemption, as taught by evangelist and apostle, confirmed by the teaching and testimony of Justin Martyr, Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian of Carthage, and Origen of Egypt and Palestine, and illustrated in Christian art. The chain of evidence is complete for the first seven hundred years from the beginning of the Christian era. Not only were John and Jesus individually historical characters and contemporaries, but both are at a remove from the mythical conceits of modern criticism, whose relation to each other is substantiated as affirmed in the several Gospels.

CHAPTER V.

THE HISTORICAL CHRIST AND ANCIENT
CHRISTIANITY.

- I. THE CHRIST OF CHRISTIANITY.
- II. THE DOCTRINES OF CHRISTIANITY.
- III. THE INSTITUTIONS OF CHRISTIANITY.
- IV. THE CHRISTIANITY OF CHRIST.

CHAPTER V.

THE HISTORICAL CHRIST AND ANCIENT CHRISTIANITY.

§85. Sources: Biographical Epitomes, and Literature.

1. LUCIAN (120-200) was born in Samosata, Syria, and flourished in the reign of Trajan (98-117). He has been characterized as "a brilliant but frivolous rhetorician," "an epicurean, worldling, and infidel, . . . who could see in Christianity only one of the vagaries and follies of mankind; in miracles only jugglery; in the belief of immortality an empty dream; and in contempt of death and brotherly love of Christians . . . a silly enthusiasm." (Schaff.) In a letter to one Chronis, under the guise of a narrative, he represents as a Christian the death of one Proteus or Peregrinus, and assails the Christians and their religion with wit and ridicule. It is a parody and fiction. Lucian, however, admits that, in his times, the Christian people were worshipers of Christ. His testimony will be given at different points as it may be appropriate.
2. TACITUS (d. 110) was a Roman historian of fame "who ranks, beyond dispute, in the highest place among men of letters of all ages, who lived in the latter half of the first, and in the early part of the second century of our era." His two historical works known now as *History* and *Annals* were originally but one work, and cover a period from A. D. 14 to 68. "An attempt has recently been made to prove that the *Annals* are a forgery by Poggio Bracciolini, an Italian scholar of the fifteenth century; but their genuineness is confirmed by the agreement in various minute details with coins and inscriptions discovered since that period. [Besides] Rudolphus, a monk of the monastery of Fulda, in Hesse-Cassel, writing in the ninth century, says that Cornelius Tacitus speaks of a river known as the Weser or the Visurgis. In the *Annals*, as they have come down to us, we find the Visurgis mentioned five times in the first two books; whence we conclude that a manuscript of them was in existence in the ninth century. Add to this the testimony of Jerome [A. D. 345-420], that Tacitus wrote in thirty books the lives of the Cæsars, and the evidence of style, and there can not be much doubt that in the *Annals* we have a genuine work of Tacitus." "Much of the history of that period must have been

obscure and locked up in the emperor's private papers and memoranda. . . . Tacitus, as a man of good social position, no doubt had access to the best information, and must have talked matters over with the most eminent men of the day." (*Encyclopædia Britannica*, Vol. IX, 9th ed., p. 25; Phil'a. See *Annals* xv, 44.)

3. CLEMENT OF ROME, the earliest of the Apostolic Fathers, otherwise known as the immediate pupils and successors of the apostles. Clement is said to have succeeded Linus, as second Bishop of Rome, in the year 67, or Cletus (Anacletus) as third Bishop, in 91, holding the office for nine years, and died in 100. He wrote a letter in the name of the whole Church at Rome to the Corinthians to compose certain dissensions among them about the authorities placed over them by the appointment of the apostles. It was written either about 64, or soon after the persecution of Nero, or in 94, or 95, just after the persecutions under Domitian. He is placed in the catalogue of martyrs; but it is quite as probable that he died a natural death in the third year of the reign of Trajan, A. D. 100. He is understood to be identical with the person referred to by Paul, who mentions "*Clement also, and with other my fellow-laborers, whose names are in the Book of Life.*" (Philipp. iv, 3.) He cites passages from the Gospels of Matthew and Luke; also from Paul's Epistles.
4. ARISTIDES (MARCIANUS) was a philosopher of Athens mentioned by Eusebius (E. H. iv, c. 3) as the contemporary of Quadratus. He describes him as a "faithful man of our religion, who left an *Apology of our Faith*, as Quadratus did, addressed to Hadrian (who reigned 117-138). Jerome confirms Eusebius, and relates that after Aristides became a Christian, he still continued to wear the garb of a philosopher, and that he presented to Hadrian "a book containing an account of our sect; that is, an *Apology for the Christians*, which is still extant, a monument with the learned of his ingenuity." (*De Illustribus Viris*, I, 20.)
 This work of Aristides was lost for many centuries, but was recently discovered in complete form. An Armenian translation found in 1878 was the first document covering the *Apology* brought to light. This copy Rénan, with his characteristic repugnance to Christianity, at once denounced as spurious. But in 1889, Rendel Harris, of Philadelphia, while traveling in Syria, discovered at St. Catherine, at Mt. Sinai, a Syrian manuscript containing a translation of the long lost *Apology* of Aristides. Its accordancy with the Armenian document is such as completely substantiates the identity and authenticity of this *Apology*. But there is a curious discrepancy in that the Syrian MS. makes it clear that the document was addressed to Antoninus Pius (emperor 139-161) instead

of Hadrian (117-138), according to the Armenian document, Eusebius, and Jerome. "Now, this name is otherwise known as that of a Christian of great authority in Smyrna, living about A. D. 138-140." (Cruftwell, *Literary Hist. of Early Christianity*, Vol. I, 292.) This whole *Apology* was found to have been transferred into an old Latin romance found at Vienna by Armitage Robinson, editor of the "Cambridge Texts and Studies contributing to the illustration of Biblical Literature." The romance was designated *History of Barlaam and Joseph (or Josephat)*. Aristides's *Apology* contains an early formulation of the "Apostles' Creed," though not quite complete.

5. PORPHYRY was a Phœnician, born at Tyre, about 233, in the reign of Alexander Severus, and is said to have descended from a noble ancestry who were kings. His name means *purple*, which was the kingly robe. Jerome and Chrysostom call his name *Bataneotes*. In the *Ecclesiastical History* of Socrates he is said to have once been a Christian, but that having received a beating by some Christians in Palestine, he apostatized out of resentment and mortification. About A. D. 270, Porphyry wrote a work against the Christians in fifteen books, only fragments of which are now extant. Apollinaris of Syria elaborately refuted Porphyry's work. A letter of Constantine, written soon after the Council of Nice in 325, refers to "Porphyry, that enemy of true piety, who has received a fit reward for his impious writings against religion, so that he is made infamous to all future times, and covered with reproach, and his impious *writings have been destroyed*." Nevertheless, in 449, by the edict of Theodosius the Younger, Porphyry's writings were abolished; which would indicate that some copies had escaped the flames. (See also Eusebius, *Eccl. Hist.* VI, c. 19, pp. 224, 225.) His fragments against the Christians which remain are of evidential value and service now in respect to the early origin and historicity of the New Testament.
6. PLINY THE YOUNGER (61-116) was nephew of Pliny the elder, who was the author of a work on *Natural History*. The junior Pliny was adopted into the imperial family by his uncle, and educated to be an advocate of the law. He was born of noble ancestry. He studied rhetoric under the best masters of Rome, among whom was Quintilian. It is related that he composed a Greek tragedy in his youth, and that he spoke at the forum at the age of nineteen. He had also notable friends. Tacitus and he were intimates and correspondents, and Pliny became a great favorite with the Emperor Trajan. During the last decade of the first century he was appointed to a number of public offices in the empire, and seems to have conducted their affairs with success and approval. He occupied the position of proconsul of Bithynia

and Pontus in Asia Minor, 109-111 A. D. He was the author of ten books, the last of which contains his famous correspondence with the emperor respecting the persecutions of the Christians resident in the province which he ruled. His testimony is invaluable.

7. **MARCUS AURELIUS ANTONINUS** (Emp. 161-180) was a Stoic philosopher, born at the capital 121 A. D., and died 180. He was well educated. Antoninus Pius, his predecessor in the imperial office, adopted him in his family. His philosophy as a Stoic disqualified him to understand the character and sufferings of the Christians, whose religion he treated with scorn. Apologies were tendered to him as emperor by Melito, Miltiades, Athanagoras, and others, in behalf of his Christian subjects, on account of the persecutions which raged during his reign. He was devoted to the gods of the State. Believing that at death we are absorbed into the essence of the Deity, he utterly rejected the Christian doctrine of immortality. Dr. Jortin observes: "The Emperor Marcus was prejudiced against the Christians, and in his book . . . censures very unreasonably what he ought to have approved,—this readiness and resolution to die for their religion." (*Truth of the Christian Religion*, p. 57.) Aurelius wrote: "What a soul that is which is ready if at any moment it must be separated from the body, and is ready either to be extinguished, or dispersed, or continued to exist; but only so that this readiness [to die] comes from a man's own judgment *not from sheer obstinacy as with the Christians*, [μὴ κατὰ ψιλὴν παράταξιν, literally, "Not according to naked discipline as with the Christians"], but considerately and with dignity, and in a way to persuade another *without scenic display απαργφδως, untragically, without noise or fuss.* (*Meditat.* xi, 3.)

Dr. Philip Schaff remarks: "The empire was visited at that time by a number of conflagrations, a destructive flood of the Tiber, an earthquake, insurrections, and particularly a pestilence which spread from Ethiopia to Gaul. This gave rise to bloody persecutions in which the government and people united against the enemies of the gods and the supposed authors of these misfortunes." (*Hist. Christ. Church*, Vol. II, 55.)

8. **CONSTANTINE THE GREAT** (247-337), the first Christian emperor of the Roman Empire. Though favorable to Christianity, he did not himself profess to be a Christian until a week before his death, when he was baptized. By degrees he introduced the Christian religion as the religion of the State, between A. D. 311 and 325. "The first Edict of Toleration, A. D. 311, made an end of persecutions; the second Edict of Toleration, 313 (there was no third), prepared the way for legal recognition and protection; the Nicene Council, 325, marks the solemn inauguration of the imperial State Church." (Schaff's *Hist. Christ. Church*, Vol. II, Preface, p. 5.)

9. DIDACHÉ, or the "TEACHING OF THE TWELVE APOSTLES," written A. D. 70-100. This is a most interesting document in Christian criticism. Its opening sentence reads: "*Teaching of the Lord by the Twelve Apostles to the Nations.*" Its evidential value is of supreme importance. For full description of the document and its contents, see Appendix, *Excursus D.*
10. JOHN STUART MILL was of Scottish blood, born at London in 1806. He pursued his collegiate studies solely under the instructions of his own father, and early mastered the classics and higher mathematics. He says of himself that he could not remember the time when he could not read Greek; but was told that he began the study when he was but three years old! Unquestionably Mill possessed an extraordinarily precocious mind. He seems to have been as remarkable for the utter deficiency of a religious nature. He claimed to have never had a religious belief. Accordingly he was a practical Atheist. His best known works are his *Autobiography*, and his *Three Essays on Theism*. His death occurred in 1873. Among his last utterances was this:

"About the life and sayings of Jesus there is a stamp of originality, combined with a profundity of insight, which, if we abandon the idle expectation of finding scientific precision where something very different was aimed at, must place the Prophet of Nazareth, even in the estimation of those who have no belief in his inspiration, in the very first rank of men of sublime genius of whom our species can boast. . . . Nor even now would it be easy even for an unbeliever to find a better translation of the rule of virtue from the abstract into the concrete than to endeavor so to live that Christ would approve our life."

THE CHRIST AND CHRISTIANITY.

Rabbi, we know that thou art a Teacher come from God.—NICODEMUS.

The teachings of Jesus carried forward morality to the sublimest point attained or attainable by humanity. The influence of spiritual religion has been rendered doubly great by the unparalleled purity and elevation of his own character.—"SUPERNATURAL RELIGION" (ANONYMOUS).

Repose now in thy glory, noble Founder! Fear no more to see the edifice of thy labors fall by any fault. Thou shalt become the Cornerstone of humanity so entirely that to tear thy name from this world would rend it to its foundation.—RÉNAN.

Yes, if the life and death of Socrates were those of a sage, the life and death of Jesus were those of a God; and the history of Socrates, which no one doubts, is not as well attested as that of Jesus Christ.—ROUSSEAU.

It is reserved for Christianity to present to the world an ideal character which, through all the ages of eighteen centuries, has inspired the hearts of men with an impassioned love, has shown itself capable of acting on all ages, nations, temperaments, and conditions. . . . In three short years of his active life, Jesus has done more to regenerate and soften mankind than all the disquisitions of philosophers and all the exhortations of moralists.—LECKY.

As little as humanity will ever be without religion, as little will it be without Christ; for to have religion without Christ is absurd. . . . And this Christ, so far as he is separable from the highest style of religion, is historical, not mythical.—STRAUSS.

It is no use to say that Christ as exhibited in the Gospels is not historical.—J. S. MILL.

ARGUMENT.

JESUS CHRIST being inducted into his unique ministry by baptism, leads to the consideration of his special function as the great Teacher of men, and the Founder of Christianity. In these offices he has been distinctly recognized by both friends and foes of the Christian religion. That the system which originated in him had an historical basis is evidenced, not only by universal testimony, but by the very doctrines he taught and by the institutions he founded, which have been perpetuated through all the ages since, and transmitted to us. We now find them to be identical with the tenets maintained throughout Christendom. By such means the historical antiquity and authenticity of the Christian religion are demonstrated.

1. The Christ of Christianity.
2. The Doctrines of Christianity.
3. The Institutions of Christianity.
4. The Christianity of Christ.

THE UNIQUE MINISTRY OF CHRIST.

As Jesus himself was not a sinner,¹ it is not needful that he should be baptized as others were, to make public confession of sin and reformation of life. John's surprise and hesitation to perform the rite in this case was most natural. He said, "I have need to be baptized of thee, and comest thou to me!" Jesus replied, "Suffer it to be so now, for thus it becometh us to fulfill all righteousness. Then he suffered him."² What wrought this change in the consciousness and purpose of John? Obviously he discovered a deeper and special sense in the words, "*It becometh us to fulfill*

¹ John viii, 46; 1 Pet. i, 19; ii, 22; 2 Cor. v, 21; Heb. iv, 15.

² Matt. iii, 14, 15.

all righteousness," as apart from the confession of sin. The rite administered by the Forerunner as an initiative act would serve to place Jesus in public recognition by his example, as within touch and sympathy with all who were truly penitent; the "One who taketh away the sin of the world;" and by the Spirit's descent upon him in the form of a dove, and the voice from heaven announcing him as the "well-beloved Son," would complete the identification, and emphasize the fact that Jesus was hereby entering upon his Messianic ministry.

Christ united in himself all the functions of a *leader* of thought, a *teacher* of truth, and a *preacher* of righteousness. These high qualities he so exemplified as to justify their recognition by both friends and foes of Christianity. This fact finds support, if not absolute verification on the part of inveterate enemies, in Christ's life as well as in the first centuries after his death; and their testimony may be cited, not because their *opinions* of Jesus are evidential, but because their *concessions of fact are invaluable*. His instructions were so original and forceful—so unlike the scribes'—so powerful in address, so lasting in impression, that his teaching was an astonishment to the people. When Jesus had concluded his discourse upon the mountains, "the multitudes were astonished at his teaching, for he taught them as one having authority, and not as the scribes." When the officers of the Sanhedrin were sent to arrest Jesus, they returned without the intended prisoner, saying, "Never man so spake."³

Celsus especially makes much of Jesus in respect to the three functions of his ministry: as a Leader, Teacher, and Preacher. He assumes rather than affirms these functions and prerogatives as characteristics of Christ's work. He says:

"No good general and leader . . . was ever betrayed, nor even a wicked captain of robbers," . . . [but] Jesus, failing to acquire "the good-will" of his disciples, proved himself inferior to "a brigand chief!"⁴ "If you should tell them that Jesus is *not* the Son of

§ 87. Functions of His Ministry.

§ 88. Jesus as a Leader.

³ John vii, 46. ⁴ Origen *adv. Celsum*, ii, 12.

God . . . they would not consent to discontinue their worship of him who is their Leader in the sedition."⁵ "For they descend from the same original, and they have received their Master and Leader from the same country, and yet have revolted from the Jews."⁶

Origen, replying to Celsus, says:

"Celsus. . . . proceeds . . . to speak of our Savior as having been the Leader of our generation in so far as we are Christians."⁷

Suetonius, also referring to Christ's leadership, says:

"Claudius banished from Rome those who were continually making disturbances, Christ being their Leader."⁸

Celsus and others refer to Jesus also as the great *Teacher* of the Christian world. He says:

Christ's associates "shared all things in common, and had him for their Teacher who was deemed to be a Savior and Son of the greatest God."⁹ "In the next place, those who were his associates while alive, and who listened to his voice, and enjoyed his instructions, on seeing him subjected to death,"¹⁰ etc. "Let us pass over the refutations which he adduced against the claims of their Teacher."¹¹ "A few years ago he began to teach this doctrine, being regarded as the Son of God."

Origen, replying, says: Christ "our Superintendent, then, and Teacher, having come forth from the Jews, regulates the whole world by the word of his teaching;"¹² and Josephus mentions "Jesus, a wise man, . . . a Teacher of such as receive the truth with pleasure."¹³

Celsus thus refers to the *preaching* of our Lord:

"While he was in the body and no one believed on him, he preached to all without intermission."¹⁴ "The man of Nazareth promulgated laws quite opposed to these [of Moses], declaring that no one can come to the Father who loves power, or riches, or glory; that men ought not to be more careful in providing food than the ravens; that they were to be less concerned about their raiment than the lilies; that to him who has given them one blow, they should offer to receive another."¹⁵

The testimonies of Celsus, Suetonius, and Origen concur in representing Jesus Christ as the great *Leader of men*; of Celsus, Josephus, and Origen as their greatest *Teacher*; while

⁵ *Origen adv. Celsum*, viii, 14.

⁶ *Ib.*, v, 33; *Lard.* vii, 254.

⁷ *Ib.*, i, 26.

⁸ *Life of Claudius*, 25.

⁹ *Cels.*, ii, 9.

¹⁰ *Ib.*, ii, 45.

¹¹ *Ib.*, v, 52.

¹² *Ib.*, i, 26; v, 33.

¹³ *Ant.*, xviii, 3, 3.

¹⁴ *Cels.*, ii, 70.

¹⁵ *Ib.*, vii, 18.

Celsus alone, with some perversity and prejudice, clearly concedes and substantiates the fact of his *preaching*, by referring directly to points and passages found in Christ's Sermon on the Mount. These qualities and characteristics, then, sufficiently represent his ministry. But this is not all. It is conceivable at least that Jesus might have led men, taught the truth, and preached salvation, without securing any permanent success in the world. John, in a more restricted sense, exercised these same prerogatives, but left no system behind him.

But Jesus was the Founder of Christianity. Powerfully did he reason with men; but he wrote no books to perpetuate the argument. Yet he wrought the deepest and most enduring convictions in the spiritual nature,—
§ 91. Jesus as Founder.
 convictions of sinfulness, of escape made certain; and to the believing he brought a present comfort in cleansing, and for the future a boundless hope of happiness in the life after death. That Christ did found the religion which bears his name, is that which is either affirmed or conceded by adversaries, both ancient and modern.

a) Tacitus testifies that—

“Christ, THE FOUNDER OF THAT NAME, had been put to death as a criminal by Pontius Pilate, the procurator of Judæa, in the reign of Tiberius [Cæsar].”¹⁶

β) Lucian: “They therefore still worship that great man who was crucified in Palestine, *because he introduced into the world this new religion.* Moreover, their first Lawgiver taught them that they are all brethren when once they have turned and renounced the gods of the Greeks, and worship that Master of theirs who was crucified, and engage to live according to his laws.”¹⁷

γ) Among the modern rationalists and adversaries of Christianity is Strauss, who says:

“As little as humanity will be without religion, as little will it be without Christ. . . . He remains the highest model of religion within the range of our thought; and no perfect piety is possible without his presence in the heart. To the historical person of Christ belongs all in his life that exhibits his religious perfection, his religious discourses, his moral action, and his [wonderful] passion.”¹⁸

¹⁶ *Annals*, xv, 44.

¹⁷ *Peregrinus*, cited by *Lard.* vii, 279, 280.

¹⁸ *Essay*, in *Amer. Tract Society*, p. 308.

δ) Lecky, a rationalist skeptic, but one of the fairest and ablest of modern historians, says:

“It may be truly said that the simple record of three short years of [Christ’s] active life has done more to regenerate and soften mankind than all the disquisitions of philosophers and all the exhortations of moralists. This has indeed been the wellspring of whatever is best and purest in Christian life. And amid all the sins and failings, amid all the priestcraft and persecution and fanaticism that have defaced the Church, it has preserved, in the character and example of its FOUNDER, an enduring principle of regeneration.”¹⁹

ε) Rénan addresses this apostrophe to Jesus at his sepulcher:

“Repose now in thy glory, noble Founder! Fear no more to see the edifice of thy labors fall by any fault. Henceforth, beyond the reach of human frailty, thou shalt witness from the heights of divine peace the infinite results of thy acts. . . . A thousand times more alive, a thousand times more beloved, since thy death than during thy passage here below, thou shalt become the corner-stone of humanity so entirely, that to tear thy name from this world, would be to rend it to its foundations. Between thee and God there is no longer any distinction! Complete Conquerer of Death! take possession of thy kingdom, whither shall follow thee, by the royal road which thou hast traced, ages of worshippers!”²⁰

§ 92. Confirmations by Ancient Christian Writers.

1. Clement of Rome, the contemporary and fellow-laborer of Paul, says: “The apostles received the gospel for us from the Lord Jesus Christ.”²¹

2. Aristides (123): “The Christians reckon the beginning of their religion from Jesus Christ, who is named the Son of God, the Most High.”²²

3. Tertullian (200): “Tiberius, accordingly, in whose days the Christian name made its entry into the world. . . . We date the origin of our religion, as we have before mentioned, from the reign of Tiberius. We have set forth this origin of our sect and name, with this account of the founder of Christianity.”²³

The historical evidence of the *beginning* of Christianity needs to be traversed no further to find its Founder. This line of proof substantiates the character and functions engaged in Christ’s Messianic ministry: His *leadership*, by which so many people coming in contact were immediately attracted to his

¹⁹ *Hist. Europ. Morals*, Eng. ed. ii, 9.

²⁰ *Life of Christ*, 1866, p. 351.

²¹ Lightfoot’s transl. of *Epis. to Cor.*, c. 42.

²² *Apology*, first ed. ²³ Tertull., *Apology*, cc. 5, 7, 21.

person and became his followers; his *teaching*, by means of which they were instructed in all spiritual truth as the Revealer of God; his *preaching*, by which he appealed to their spiritual conscience and inspired the believing with the new hope of life and immortality brought to light through the Gospel. The Christian writers adduced, not only *confirm* the testimony of the ancient adversaries, but carry back those same facts through the line of Christian history to the very apostles, and recognize Jesus Christ as their Divine Source. Modern criticisms of the rationalistic and destructive school reach the same conclusion, and do not hesitate to exalt and glorify Jesus as the Founder of the Christian faith. Even the mention of Jesus thus in relation to his work, without any attempt to refute the facts, which rather the adversaries fully concede, makes powerfully for the antiquity of the period, the authenticity of the account, and the historicity of the Gospels.

THE DOCTRINES OF CHRISTIANITY.

We pass from the Ministry of Christ to his Doctrines. It is evident that the pagan writers of that period had also remarkable familiarity with the Christian teachings. Their frequent reference to them, even derisively, proves, from their standpoint of disbelief, that the Christian doctrines synchronize with Christ and his apostles, and that the teachings of to-day are identical with those of the New Testament. These may be briefly indicated.

a) Celsus: "You, O sincere believers, find fault with us, because we do not recognize this individual [Christ] as God, nor agree with you that he endured these [sufferings] for the benefit of mankind. It was to sinners that God has been sent;" "who was deemed to be a Savior, and the Son of the greatest God." "I am God; or I am the Son of God. . . . I have come because the world is perishing; and you, O men, are perishing for your iniquities. But I wish to save you; and ye shall see me returning again with heavenly power. Blessed is he who does me homage." "O Jews and Christians, no God nor Son of God, either came or will come down

§93. Benefits*
of Christ's
Death.

* On Benefits of Christ's Death, etc. See Rom. iii, 26; v, 6, 8, 11; xiv, 8, 9; 2 Cor. v, 15; 1 Cor. xv, 3; 1 Thess. v, 10; i, 10; Tit. ii, 14; Gal. iv, 4, 5.

[from heaven] to mankind.²⁴ Again if God, like Jupiter in the comedy, should, on awakening from his lengthened slumber, desire to rescue the human race from evil, why did he send this Spirit, of which you speak, into one corner [of the earth]? . . . Do you not think that you have made the Son of God more ridiculous in sending him to the Jews?"²⁵

β) *Toledoth Jeshu* says that Jesus taught that his blood atoned for the sins of mankind; that he created the heavens and the earth and all they contain; that he appropriated to himself the fifty-third chapter of Isaiah: "He was wounded for our transgressions; he was bruised for our iniquities," etc. He also applied to himself Psalm cx: "The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand until I make thine enemies thy footstool," etc.

γ) Porphyry; "If Christ, as he says, be the way of salvation and the life, and only they who believe on him can be saved, what became of the men who lived before his coming?"²⁶

Celsus: "Also, those who are long since dead which will arise from the earth clothed with the self-same flesh [as during this life]; for such

§94. Resurrection of the Human Body.* a hope is simply one *which might be cherished by worms.*"²⁷
"For, what sort of a soul is that which would still long for a body that has been subject to corruption? Whence also this opinion of yours [which] is not shared by some

of the Christians, and they pronounce it to be exceeding vile and loathsome, and impossible? For what kind of a body is that which, after being completely corrupted, can return to its original nature, and to that self-same first condition out of which it fell into dissolution? Being unable to return any answer, they betake themselves to a most absurd refuge; viz., that all things are possible to God."²⁸

Lucian: "For these miserable men have no doubt that they shall be immortal and live forever. Therefore they contemn death, and many surrender themselves to sufferings."²⁹

Celsus: "But my prophet once declared in Jerusalem that the Son of God will come as the Judge of the righteous, and Punisher of the wicked."³⁰ "And those who know not the punishments

§96. Judgment of the World. which await them will repent and grieve in vain; while those who are faithful to me, I will preserve eternally, . . . but they give occasion to every fool or impostor to apply them to suit his own purposes."³¹

Porphyry: "Christ threatens everlasting punishment to those who do not believe in him; and yet in another place he says, 'With what measure ye mete, it shall be measured to you again,' which is absurd and contradictory; for all measures must be limited to time."³²

* Rom. viii, 11, 22, 23; Philip. iii, 21; Eph. v, 23.

²⁴ *Cels.* ii, 38; iii, 62; ii, 9; vi, 9; v, 2, 3.

²⁵ Cited by *Lard.* vii, 439; cf. John xiv, 6.

²⁶ *Cels.* v, 14; comp. Matt. xix, 26; Mark x, 27.

²⁷ *Cels.* i, 49.

²⁸ *Cels.* vii, 9.

²⁹ *Cels.* vi, 78.

³⁰ *Cels.* v, 14, σκολήκων ἐλπίς.

³¹ *Lard.* vii, 280.

³² *Lard.* vii, 440, 441.

Celsus: "It is folly on their part to suppose that when God, as if he were a cook, introduces the fire [which is to consume the world], all the rest of the human race will be burned up, while they [the good] alone will remain. 'On all the rest will I send down eternal fire, both on cities and on countries.'" ³³

Many of these representations of Christian doctrine are extremely crude, or much perverted, or both. Nevertheless, these adversaries were untrained in Christian truth, and very hostile to the Christian faith. But, despite these faulty representations, the direct references to the doctrines themselves prove the earlier antiquity and historicity of these teachings found in the New Testament.

INSTITUTIONS OF CHRISTIANITY.

a) Julian: "That some of those [Christians] who at the beginning received the word from Paul were such, is apparent from what Paul himself says writing to them: . . . 'And you are not ignorant, brethren, that such were you also. But ye are washed; but ye were sanctified in the name of Jesus Christ.'" ³⁴

"You see [that he says that] they were washed, having been washed and scoured with water that penetrates even to the soul. And baptism which can not heal the leprosy, nor the gout, nor the dysentery, nor any other distemper of the body, takes away adulteries, extortions, and all other sins of the soul!" ³⁵ "Whosoever is a ravisher, a murderer, guilty of sacrilege, or any other abomination, let him come boldly, for when I have washed him with this water I will immediately make him clean and innocent; and if he commits the same crimes again, I will make him as clean as before, after he has thumped his breast and beat his head!" ³⁶

"I desire not to hear so much of any service of yours, as that you have expelled the wicked Athanasius [a Christian bishop, A. D. 326] out of Egypt, who, under my government, has been so audacious as to persuade Greek women, wives of illustrious men, to receive baptism!" ³⁷

β) The *Didaché* or the invaluable document, titled *The Teaching of the Apostles*,* which dates A. D. 70-100, furnishes absolute confirmation of the fact and early usage of baptism as a Christian institution:

"But concerning baptism, thus shall ye baptize: Having first recited all these things, baptize in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, in living [*i. e.*, running] water. But if thou hast not

* Matt. xxviii, 19; Mark xvi, 16; Acts ii, 41; viii, 38; ix, 18; x, 47, 48; xvi, 15, 33; and 1 Cor. i, 13-16; Gal. iii, 27.

³³ Cels. v, 14; vii, 9.

³⁴ 1 Cor. vi, 9-11.

³⁵ Lard. vii, 634, 635.

³⁶ Julian (in Lard. vii, 636). ³⁷ Epis. to Ecditius, præfect of Egypt, in Lard. vii, 644.

living water, then baptize in other water; and if thou art not able in cold, then in warm [water]. But if thou hast neither, then pour³⁸ water on the head thrice, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit.”³⁹

Pliny the Younger (110) obviously refers to the administration of *the Lord's Supper* as the usage of the § 101. The Lord's Supper. primitive Church, observed on the Lord's day:

“They [the Christians] were accustomed to meet on a stated day before it was light, and sing a hymn of praise to Christ as God; to bind themselves by an oath for the non-perpetration of any wickedness. . . . After this they were accustomed to separate, and then reassemble to eat a harmless meal.”⁴⁰

α) Tertullian (200): “Before daybreak in congregations we take from the hand of none but the presidents, the sacrament of the Eucharist which the Lord commanded to be eaten at meal-times, and enjoined to be taken by all alike.”⁴¹

β) Irenæus (178): “And in this state of affairs they held fellowship with each other, and Anicetus conceded to Polycarp, in the church, the celebration of the Eucharist, by showing him respect.”⁴²

γ) Justin Martyr (147): “Those who are called by us deacons give to each of those present to partake of the bread and wine, mixed with water, over which the thanksgiving was pronounced; and to those who were absent they carry away a portion. And this food is called amongst us *the Eucharist*,* of which no one is allowed to partake but the man who believes that the things which we teach are true, and who has been washed with the washing that is for the remission of sins and unto regeneration, and who is so living as Christ enjoined.”⁴³

δ) Ignatius (110): “Take heed, then, to have but one Eucharist. For there is [but] one flesh of our Lord Jesus Christ, and one cup to [show forth] the unity of his blood.⁴⁴ Let that be deemed a proper Eucharist which is [administered] either by the bishop, or by one to whom he has intrusted it.”⁴⁵

ε) *Didaché* (70–100): “But as touching the Eucharistic thanksgiving, give ye thanks thus—first as regards the cup: ‘We give thanks, O our Father, for the holy vine of thy Son David, that thou didst make known to us through thy Son Jesus. Thine is the glory for ever and ever.’ Then as regards the broken bread: ‘We give thanks, O our Father, for the life and knowledge which thou didst make known to us, through thy Son Jesus. Thine is the glory for ever and ever. As this broken bread was scattered upon the mountains, and being gathered together became one, so may thy Church be

* *Εὐχαριστία*, *Thanksgiving*.

³⁸ *Ἐκχεῖν*—to pour out, to shed, etc.

⁴⁰ Official Epis. to Emp. Trajan.

⁴³ *First Apology*, cc. 65, 66.

⁴⁵ Epis. to Smyrneans, 9.

³⁹ *Didache*, or *Teachings of the Apostles*, c. 7.

⁴¹ *De Corona*, c. 3.

⁴² *Fragments*, c. 3.

⁴⁴ Epis. to Phila., 4.

gathered together from the ends of the earth into thy kingdom. For thine is the glory and power through Jesus Christ, for ever and ever." "And on the Lord's-day gather yourselves together and break bread, and give thanks, first confessing your transgressions, that your sacrifice may be pure."⁴⁶

On the Eucharist, Dr. Philip Schaff makes the following pointed remark :

"The Lord's Supper was universally regarded, not only as a sacrament, but also as a sacrifice; the true and eternal sacrifice of the New Covenant, superseding all the provisional and typical sacrifices of the Old; taking the place particularly of the Passover, or the Feast of the typical Redemption from Egypt."⁴⁷

Following the brief intimation given by Pliny of the existent usage of the primitive Christians, who met on a specific day to observe the Lord's Supper, which he mentions as "a harmless meal," the ground traversed

§ 104.
Résumé.

is that of the first two centuries, taken, however, in the reverse order of the chronology in order to connect the established usage with that of the apostles. An inspection of the testimonies develops that at the beginning, as was most natural, instructions were given concerning the nature of the Eucharist, its *administrators*, and the method of its administration, establishing thus from the beginning this usage of Christianity. Tertullian mentions the *fact* that the Christians did assemble before daylight, as Pliny affirms, and on the Lord's command all alike partook of the supper called the Eucharist. Irenæus indicates *the characteristic* of Christian fellowship and the proper respect due the administrator. Justin represents the *manner* of the administration and the character requisite in the recipients. Ignatius explains *the nature* of the feast. The *Teaching of the Apostles* enjoins the service of the early Church and the *method to be observed* in the remembrance and honoring of Jesus Christ its Founder. Thus we are brought back to the apostolic usage in the Apostolic Age. It remains to be remarked that the two institutions—baptism and the Lord's Supper—being identified with the origin of Chris-

⁴⁶ *Didache*, c. 9, 14.

⁴⁷ *Hist. Christ. Church*, Vol. II, 245. See 1 Cor. v, 7.

tianity, are themselves monuments in evidence of the antiquity of the Christian religion, and of those Scriptures whose contents gave an account of these two institutions.⁴⁸

THE INSTITUTION OF THE LORD'S DAY.

The Christian Sabbath-day, which commemorates the resurrection of Christ, happened to coincide with Sun-day on the Roman calendar, the day dedicated to the worship of the Sun. Familiarity with the name of that day renders it easy to understand how the Christians came to call their sacred rest day "Sunday." Nevertheless, it is a heathen designation and without authority from the Scriptures. The apostles themselves never so named the Christian Sabbath, but uniformly referred to it as "*the first day of the week*,"⁴⁹ or "*the Lord's day*,"⁵⁰ which indicates its purpose. This accordancy in observing the same day by both heathen and Christian peoples, though for different reasons, explains why the Christians excited no surprise in the minds of their heathen neighbors, that their writers should not give the Sabbath special mention. However, Pliny, when governing Bithynia and Pontus in Asia Minor, in his famous letter to the Emperor Trajan, mentions the Christian custom of meeting before the light of day, "*on a stated day*,"⁵¹ to engage in singing a hymn of praise to Jesus as God, when they all partook of the harmless meal. That this was on the Sabbath is obvious from the fact that the Christians met on no other day for such purpose. Pliny's reference to the Christian Sabbath is confirmed by the following testimonies:

1. The Council of Nicæa (A. D. 325) was the first Œcumenical Council held, and among its very first decisions declared:

"Forasmuch as some on the Lord's-day bow the knee in prayer, as also on other days of Pentecost, for the sake of uniformity, they shall now stand to offer their prayers to God."⁵²

⁴⁸ Matt. xxvi, 26-29; Mark xiv, 22-25; Luke xxii, 14-20; John xiii. Recorrob-
orated by 1 Cor. v, 7, 8; xi, 23-29. ⁴⁹ Acts xx, 7; 1 Cor. xvi, 2. ⁵⁰ Rev. i, 10.

⁵¹ "*Stato die*," Letter to Trajan. ⁵² Council Nicæa, xx.

2. The Emperor Constantine, a few years before (321) published an edict recalling both the heathen and the Christian subjects from their industries on the Sabbath-^{§ 107. Constantine's Edict.} day, which he designates as "the venerable day of the Sun." By this appellation all recognized his meaning the Christian Sabbath. He said :

"Let all the judges and populations of towns, and the duties of all professions be discontinued on the venerable day of the Sun."⁵³

3. Eusebius, the historian (315), says :

"The Churches throughout the rest of the world who observe the practice that has prevailed from apostolic tradition until the present time ; so that it would not be proper to terminate our fast on any other day but the day of the resurrection of our Savior. Hence there were Synods and Convocations of the Bishops on this question, and all unanimously drew up an ecclesiastical decree which they communicated to all the Churches in all places, that *the mystery of the Lord's resurrection should be celebrated on no other than the Lord's-day.*"⁵⁴ ^{§ 108. Church Decree.}

4. Peter, Bishop of Alexandria (300), about fifteen years earlier wrote: "*We keep the Lord's-day as a day of joy, because of Him who rose thereon.*"⁵⁵ ^{§ 109. Bishop Peter.}

5. Cyprian, Bishop of Carthage (253), eminent for his legal lore, about forty-seven years earlier, in a Synodical Letter mentions the well-known fact ^{§ 110. Bishop Cyprian.} that *the Lord's-day* was both "*the first and the eighth day.*"⁵⁶

6. Tertullian of Carthage (200), the eminent juris-consult in Roman law, said, more than a half-century before Cyprian :

"It is a well-known fact that we pray towards the east . . . because we make Sun-day a day of festivity."⁵⁷ "In the same way, if we devote Sun-day to rejoicing, from a far different reason than Sun-worship, we have some resemblance to those of you who devote the day of Saturn to ease and luxury."⁵⁸ O better fidelity of the nations to their own sect, which claims no solemnity of the Christians for itself! Not the Lord's-day,

⁵³ Baxter's *Div. App't of Lord's Day*, p. 41. ⁵⁴ *Ecc. Hist.*, B. v, c. 23.

⁵⁵ Την κυριακήν χαρμόσυνης ημέραν ἀγνευόμεν.

⁵⁶ Dr. Hesse's *Bampton Lects.* 1, ii; or McClintock and Strong's *Cyclop.* on "The Lord's Day." ⁵⁷ *To the Nations*, c. 13. ⁵⁸ *Apol.* 16.

not Pentecost, even if they had known them, would they have shared with us; for they would fear lest they should seem to be Christians. [Though we share with them Sunday], *we are not apprehensive lest we seem to be heathens.*"⁵⁹

7. Irenæus, Bishop of Lyons (178), about twenty-two years earlier than Tertullian, wrote: "The mystery of the Lord's resurrection may not be celebrated on any other day than the Lord's-day."⁶⁰

8. Bardesanes, a learned heretic of Edessa (160), in a work entitled, *Laws of the Countries*, addressed to the Emperor Marcus Aurelius Antoninus (reigned 161-180), about eighteen years earlier than Irenæus, wrote:

"Wherever we be, all of us are called by the one name of the Messiah, [viz.] 'Christians,' and upon one day, which is the first of the week, we assemble ourselves together, and on the appointed days we abstain from food."⁶¹

9. Justin Martyr, who is said to have been born in the close of the first century, when John was still living, wrote (135-145):

"Sunday is a day on which we all hold our common assembly, because it is the first day on which God, having wrought a change in the darkness and matter, made the world; and Jesus Christ our Savior, on that day rose from the dead. . . . And on the day called Sunday all who live in cities or in the country gather together in one place, and the memoirs of the apostles, or the writings of the prophets, are read as long as time permits."⁶²

10. Ignatius, Bishop of Antioch, Syria (110), wrote about thirty years earlier than Justin:

"If, then, those who walked in the ancient practices attained unto newness of hope, no longer observing Sabbaths, but fashioning their lives after the Lord's-day, on which our Life also arose through Him, . . . that we may be found disciples of Jesus Christ, our only Teacher."⁶³

⁵⁹ *On Idolatry*, c. 14.

⁶⁰ Synod. Letter to Bishop Victor of Rome, cited in McClintock and Strong's *Cyclop.*, v, 507.

⁶¹ See Cureton's transl. in McClintock and Strong's *Cyclop.*, v, 507.

⁶² *First Apol.*, c. 67. ⁶³ *Epis. Mag.*, c. 9, Bishop Lightfoot's transl.

11. Barnabas, one of the "Apostolic Fathers" (*not* the companion of Paul), wrote about A. D. 70-79: §116. Witness

"Finally he saith, . . . Your present Sabbaths are ^{of Barnabas.} not acceptable to me. . . . I shall make a [new] beginning of the eighth day, that is the beginning of another world. Wherefore also we keep the Lord's-day with joyfulness; the day also on which Jesus rose from the dead."⁶⁴

12. The Apostle John, either A. D. 68 or 96, while recording his Apocalyptic Visions which he saw §117. Witness at Patmos, in his opening chapter says: ^{of John.}

"I, John, who am your brother and companion in tribulation, . . . was in the isle which is called Patmos, for the Word of God, and the testimony of Jesus Christ. *I was in the Spirit on the Lord's-day.*"⁶⁵

13. The *Didaché, or Teaching of the Apostles* §118. Witness (70-100), written within the Apostolic Age, reads: ^{of the Didache.}

"On the Lord's own day gather yourselves together, and break bread, and give thanks."⁶⁶

14. Paul the Apostle (about A. D. 64) spent seven days at Troas, and his companion Luke thus reports the §119. Witness apostolic rule there enjoined: ^{of Paul.}

"Upon the first day of the week, when the disciples came together to break bread, Paul preached unto them, ready to depart on the morrow." "Now concerning the collection of the saints, as I have given order to the Churches of Galatia, even so do ye. Upon the first day of the week let every one of you lay by him in store as God hath prospered him, that there be no gathering when I come."⁶⁷

The territory traversed respecting the institution of the Christian Sabbath is that period of time embraced between the establishment of the Christian religion as the §120. The religion of the Roman Empire (323-325) and ^{Résumé.} that in which the apostles themselves taught. This yields not only the apostolic teachings on this subject, but also the con-

⁶⁴ *Epis.*, c. 14

⁶⁵ Rev. i, 9, 10. If John was exiled in the reign of Nero, as all the internal evidence indicates, the Apocalypse was written about 67; if under Domitian, as the external evidence indicates, the writing occurred about 96. The earlier date is favored by Neander, Gieseler, Baur, Ewald, Lücke, Bleek, DeWette, Reuss, Dusterdieck, Weiss, Rénan, Stanley, Bishop Lightfoot, and Canon Westcott. See also Schaff's *Hist. Christ. Church*, I, 429. ⁶⁶ *Didache*, c. 14. ⁶⁷ Acts xx, 7; 1 Cor. xvi, 2.

stant practice of the Church. The testimonies cited are the most authoritative known to early Christian history; namely, of the emperor, Council, bishops, apologists, a heretic, one disciple of the apostles, the document entitled *Teaching of the Apostles*, and, finally, the utterances of two of the most distinguished apostles themselves. The witnesses are fourteen in number; and their witness comes from different centuries, from different countries, written in different languages; but each one attests the apostolic teaching and the Christian practice of observing the first day of the week as the Christian Sabbath. Moreover, they all confirm the statement made by Pliny that the Christians were accustomed to meet on "a stated day" for their sacred observances. The catena of proofs is complete, extending through the first three hundred years after the crucifixion of Christ, averaging one witness for less than every twenty-five years in consecutive order. Now, reckoning the Christian era to have begun B. C. 4, and allowing thirty-three years until the crucifixion, the observance of the Sabbath-day in all Christendom, *weekly*, has been no less than ninety-seven thousand two hundred and seventy-two times until our present twentieth century. Such, then, is a standing witness through all the centuries, from the very beginning, of the constant usage of the Church; and the Sabbath-day is itself a monumental evidence of the antiquity and the historicity of Christianity.

THE CHRISTIANITY OF CHRIST.

Jesus appears to have passed through his earlier years regarded as a peasant related to the mountain tribe of Judah, rather than as the Child of royal blood, until his entrance upon public life at the age of thirty. His first appearance is in company with the Baptist, while engaged in his initiative rite for his Messianic work. His ministry opened and closed within the brief period of three years and a half. But, in results, the world knows no comparison. His wondrous success, which augments as the

§ 121. Christ
and
Christianity.

world grows older, can never be explained on mere natural principles. As to all human resources, Christ's were conspicuous for their poverty. It was clearly a case in which triumph of power came under the worst conditions which it was possible to impose. He was born in obscurity, nurtured in poverty, and died in shame. He was without wealth, without influence, without friends, without arms or arsenals, without navy or nation, to enforce his will. Rather, he proposed the immediate aggression and complete conquests in the world merely by the power of persuasion and love; and no other man born of woman ever so impressed himself upon the consciousness of mankind. None ever attained his exalted purity of character, or acquired such place and pre-eminence in history. Wherever the story of his life is told, it makes a powerful impression, and can never be forgotten. Though now it is approaching two thousand years since his crucifixion, he was never more alive and within touch of every man's conscience. His influence has grown to be a thousand-fold greater than it was on the day when he died. Even his enemies are resistlessly stirred at the very thought of Jesus. They can not leave him alone. He will not down at their bidding. Men who will not pray, at least will blaspheme his name. But his power has never for a moment been repressed. His fame has been given to the nations. It is now encompassing the globe. It has found expression in the great languages of the earth. If all the literature relating to his words and deeds, to his life and death, were suddenly retired from the libraries of mankind, the world would stand amazed at the vacancy which would be created. That his power has changed the course of history, none can intelligently deny. Kingdoms and nations rise and fall, but his name is an everlasting name, which shall not be cut off, and his kingdom shall know no end. Millions who have learned his fame believe that Jesus was the very Son of God; and many millions more who have lived but are passed away, reposed their hope for immortality in the power of that name. If Jesus be not the Christ of Scripture, there never

was, and there never can be, another. For he fulfilled the predictions of Christ, and he did the works of Christ, and he suffered the sufferings of Christ; and now he reigns in the royalty of Christ. As Jean Paul Richter has so beautifully expressed it:

“The life of Christ concerns him who, being the holiest of the mighty and the mightiest of the holy, lifted with his pierced hand empires off their hinges, and turned the stream of centuries out of its channel, and still governs the Ages.”

It is to be noted that wherever Christianity has gone and has been cordially received, it has proved itself a stupendous fact and factor in the political world, in the practical affairs of society at large, as well as a directive power acting upon the character and life of the individual man. In every country and community where it has become permanently rooted in society or State, it has been recognized as both a conservative force in restraining vice, and an aggressive force for the upbuilding of moral and spiritual worth in human character. Those civilizations on the atlas of the globe which to-day have pre-eminence in place and power are the Christian nations which stand in the forefront of the universe just in proportion as they have stood for the enforcement of the principles and spirit of Christianity. A distinct and absolute line can be drawn on the world's map, separating and illustrating just where the gospel has gone, and where it is yet to go. It can not be ignored that the several Christian nations of Europe and America are incomparably superior to those of Asia and Africa, in intelligence, in character and happiness of the people, in civilization and government, in invention, in industry, and the arts, both practical and æsthetic, no less than in military and naval prowess. Who are the “Powers of Europe” but the most advanced Christian nations of the earth? Which are “the Dark” Continents, but those which the Christian religion has not yet penetrated and permeated, where the effete religions of a barbaric ancestry still hold in cruelest bondage the minds of a people devoted to their an-

cient traditions, with all the horrors of their fanatical and superstitious practices?

Confessedly the foremost nations of the earth are those which have founded their laws upon the legislation of Moses in the wilderness and the Sermon of Christ upon the mountains. Truly did that great judicial mind, Sir Matthew Hale, remark that "Christianity is a parcel of the common law." It does not enter the halls of legislation to dictate or make codes, but it teaches legislators right principles of equity, and molds the conscience to a sense of that which is right and just in ruling. In these nations alone has the spirit existed which destroyed the infamous slave-trade, which has broken off forever the shackles of the bondsmen; has elevated the lowly to the possibilities and realizations of places of power and preferment; has enriched countries with educational institutions for the advantage and advancement of the youth; has created homes for the aged, societies for the protection of children, founded hospitals for the sick and afflicted, established reformatories for the recovery of the erring and fallen, and built churches for the salvation of the unsaved. They have organized the people into societies to prevent cruelty to brutes. Nay, it is the very spirit and law of the Christian religion to teach kindness in the home, care for the servants, help for the poor, respect for children, deference to parents, honor to woman, reverence for the aged, love for one's neighbor, to bring charities for the destitute, missions to the pagans, and Christ everywhere for the unsaved. With such a history behind it, and such objects for activity before it, and such a spirit within it, it is obviously quite too late to attempt to relegate Christianity to the rear, or politely bow it out of existence, or assign it a place among the common myths of superstitious peoples. The impotent sneer of the disbeliever is a confession that as a reasoner he has ceased to be rational, and feels that he can not refute the just and open claims of the religion of Christ.

CHAPTER VI.

THE PROOF OF MIRACLES WROUGHT BY JESUS CHRIST.

I. PRELIMINARIES TO THE DISCUSSION.

1. General Definition of Miracles.
2. Miracles Witnessed by the Disciples.
3. Miracles not denied for Four Centuries.

II. ATTESTATIONS OF ENEMIES TO MIRACLES.

- a) *The Testimony of Jewish Writers.*
 - a. The Witness of Josephus.
 - b. The Witness of the Talmud.
 - c. The Witness of Toledoth Jeshu.
- β) *The Testimony of Roman Writers.*
 - a. The Witness of Celsus.
 - b. The Witness of Porphyry.
 - c. The Witness of Hierocles.
 - d. The Witness of Julian.
 - (a) Heathen Explanations of Miracles.
 - (b) Objection to Witnesses Considered.

III. CONFIRMATORY ATTESTATIONS TO MIRACLES.

- a. The Testimony of Origen.
- b. The Testimony of Tertullian.
- c. The Testimony of Irenæus.
- d. The Testimony of Quadratus.
- e. The Testimony of an Arabic Writer.

CHAPTER VI.

THE PROOF OF MIRACLES WROUGHT BY JESUS CHRIST.

§122. Sources: Biographical Epitomes, and Literature.

1. **HIEROCLES** (Ἱεροκλῆς, "Literary," wrote about A. D. 303) was an eminent adversary of Christianity, and being in the Roman Government was first proconsul at Bithynia in Asia Minor; also afterwards at Alexandria in Egypt (284-305). He was a man of superior philosophical acquirements, and wrote a work consisting of two books to suppress the Christian religion. It was entitled *Λόγοι Φιλαλήθεις πρὸς τοὺς Χριστιανούς*, *Truth-loving Words to the Christians*. He assails the character of Jesus and his apostles, and puts our Lord on a level with a certain magician named Apollonius of Tyana. He does not dispute any of the books of the New Testament as to their authenticity or credibility, but attempts to disparage the writers by calling them hard names. In his zeal, he testifies to the names of six of the eight different writers of these Scriptures. Unfortunately, his writing was destroyed by the mistaken judgment of some of the later Christian emperors, although, like the work of Porphyry, fragments have been preserved in the citations of other writers.
2. **QUADRATUS** (123-127) has been called "a disciple of the apostles." However that may be, he rose to pre-eminence by virtue of his genius and great activity in behalf of the Christian faith. He is said to have been the first Christian writer who presented a *Defense* (called *Apology*) of Christianity to a Roman Emperor. Eusebius describes Quadratus as "a man of understanding, and of apologetic faith," who "brought together again the Christians of Athens who had been scattered abroad by persecutions, and to have rekindled their faith." (*Ecc. Hist.* IV, 23.) Some suppose that he was that Quadratus who was Bishop of Athens, which is quite likely. At least his *Defense* being presented to the Emperor Hadrian (117-138), it was treated with imperial favor. For a time the persecutions ceased. Canon Westcott thinks that the famous Epistle to Diognetus of Mathetes was written by Quadratus. Eusebius says: "Among those who were illustrious at the time was Quadratus, who, together with the daughters of Philip, is

said to have enjoyed the gift of prophecy [see Acts xxi, 9]. . . .
 Traveling abroad, they prefer the work of evangelists, being desirous to preach Christ, *and deliver the Scriptures of the Divine Gospels:*" *καὶ τὴν τῶν θεῶν εὐαγγελίων παραδίδουσαι γραφὴν.*

3. ROUSSEAU (1712-1778), a notorious disbeliever, was born at Geneva, Switzerland, and was the child of neglect. He became first a wanderer, and afterwards a Roman Catholic. An erratic adventurer, he went to Paris at the age of thirty. He there won a prize essay awarded by the Academy of Dijon, written on the proposition, "Has the Revival of Science and Art Helped to Corrupt or to Purify Morals?" He affirmed the former hypothesis. He then devoted himself to literature. His position was, that all men are born equal; that the possession of property is a crime; that the soil belongs to no man; that the fruit of the soil belongs to every man equally; that monarchy means tyranny; and that religion is a superstition. David Hume patronized Rousseau for a while; but they soon came to a public quarrel, and Hume in self-vindication published the correspondence between them. Rousseau then wrote a handbook called *Émile*, which assailed the French Government. The work was burned and its author exiled. Rousseau, however, returned and died near Paris. He is represented in history as a man of impure life. But for subtle eloquence he had no rival in French literature. He had genius without judgment; but his greatest defect of character was the fact that he was destitute of principle. His *Confessions* (Geneva, 4 vols., 1782) have been translated into most of the civilized languages.
4. DAVID HUME (1711-1776) was a Scotchman, born at Edinburgh, and an historian of England. He developed a passion for literature early. At the age of sixteen he became a skeptic. He was a man of pure morals and amiable manners. As an historian he was in some respects very able, but inaccurate and partial. He maintained that "the doctrine of an Absolute First Cause is unwarrantable in philosophy." His famous sophism against miracles was at first proposed in mere jest to silence a Jesuit named La Fleche, who had claimed that a miracle had recently been performed in his convent. Afterwards he elaborated this idea against the miracles of the Scriptures. The fallacy of Hume's assumption has often since been exposed—in the last instance by his admirer and biographer, Thomas Huxley.
5. THOMAS H. HUXLEY, born in England in 1825, graduated with distinction from the University of London in 1845, was appointed Professor of History in the School of Mines and of Physiology in 1854, and professor in the Royal College of Surgeons in 1863-1869, was elected president of the Geological and Ethnological Societies

during 1869 and 1870. He labored most in the line of Biological Science, and distinguished himself most in Comparative Anatomy of both vertebrate and invertebrate animals, and succeeded in systematizing organisms. He proposed several rearrangements into new orders and classes. Among nine different works from his pen, are his *Lay Sermons* and his *Huxley's Hume*. He was a skeptic. His death occurred June 29, 1885.

6. DANIEL SCHENKEL, born at Dogerlin, Canton Zurich, Switzerland, in 1813. He studied theology in Bâle under the teaching of the notable De Wette and Hagenbach, and afterwards at Göttingen. He became Professor of Theology in Bâle in 1849, and in Heidelberg in 1851. He published his *Christliche Dogmatik*, in two volumes, in Wiesbaden, in 1858 and 1859, and his *Das Charakterbild Jesu* in 1864. At Heidelberg he nearly lost his position because of his rationalism.
7. KARL IMMANUEL NITZSCH, a native of Borna, Saxony, born 1787. He pursued theology at Wittenberg, and was elected professor at Bonn in 1822, and at Berlin in 1847, where he died in 1868. As a theologian, Nitzsch belonged to the orthodox school of Neander and Tholuck. He was the author of several valuable works.
8. PHILIP SCHAFF, a native of Switzerland, born in 1819. He studied at Coire, Stuttgart, Tübingen, Halle, and Berlin. He was elected Professor in the University of Berlin in 1841; and upon the recommendation of Neander and Tholuck came to America in 1844, to take a theological chair in the German Reform School in Mercersburg, Pennsylvania. Afterward he was elected Professor of Ecclesiastical History in the Union Theological Seminary in the city of New York. He was appointed president of the American Revision Committee of the Scriptures in 1871, which he is said to have regarded as the greatest compliment received in his life, especially as he had not acquired a mastery of the English until he had attained his manhood. Dr. Schaff was a man of remarkable scholarship, who did more for this country in the lines of theological literature than any man in America. Among his many productions may be named his *Person of Christ*, in reply to Rénan and Strauss (12th edition, 1882); *History of the Christian Church* (6 vols., 2d ed. enlarged and revised); and his editorship of a *Religious Encyclopædia* (3 vols., 1884).
9. GEORGE P. FISHER, born in Massachusetts in 1827. He was graduated at Brown University, Rhode Island, in 1847; also in the Theological School at New Haven, after which he studied in Germany. He was elected to the Chair of Theology in 1854, but in 1861 was transferred to the Chair of Ecclesiastical History at New Haven. He is a writer of several very valuable critical and historical works.

In 1865, Dr. Fisher published a work of rare value on the *Supernatural Origin of Christianity*; in 1883 he issued *Grounds of Theistic and Christian Belief*; and subsequently his *Beginnings of Christianity*, and another on *Church History*. "His writings are marked by learning, acuteness, solidity, and breadth of vision."

§ 123. Miracles of Jesus Christ.

The denial of miracles involves the denial of a free, living, personal God.—NITZSCH.

Seriously to raise the question would be impious, if it were not absurd.—ROUSSEAU.

Only few men are wise enough to perceive that much more intelligence is necessary to the believing of a miracle than cleverness in its denial.—SCHENKEL.

If miracles are disproved, Christianity is stripped of its essential peculiarity. The central fact of a supernatural interposition having for its end the restoration of man to communion with God is lost.—FISHER.

Christianity does, indeed, involve many difficulties, but it does not create them. The essence of Christianity lies in a miracle.—WESTCOTT.

Christ must be reckoned to be a magician, because he did many wonderful things.—HIEROCLES.

The contemporaries of Jesus, his enemies as well as his friends, believed in his power of miracles, with this difference: that one traced it to Setan, the other to God.—SCHAFF.

ARGUMENT.

During the ministry of Jesus Christ, his contemporaries had ample opportunities to witness the signs of his Messiahship in his many miracles. Multitudes realized, in their own experience or in their observation, the proof of his miraculous power, in the cure of the blind, in the recovery of the leper, in the casting out of demoniacs, in multiplying loaves for the living, in raising the dead to life. Though his enemies ignored his claims so far justified as the Messiah of prophecy, they did not deny that he certainly exercised supernatural power over nature, disease, and death, which, however, they chose to ascribe to the agency of Satan. It is a remarkable circumstance that for several centuries after our Lord's death, neither Jew nor heathen adversary attempted to deny the fact that Jesus did work miracles. Upon the contrary, they admitted it to be the truth that he wrought miraculous occurrences which they sought to explain by referring them to magic, to sorcery, or to juggling:—matters which were more familiar to the heathen mind.

Now, the admission of enemies on matters of fact is strictly evidential; but their mere opinions or interpretation of facts are not, for the reason that opinions may be only prejudices, and interpretations may be mere perversions; so that both are inadmissible in the courts, as a rule. As important concessions of facts were embodied in the literary works of enemies written expressly to destroy the Christian religion with the people anciently, these will here be reproduced to verify and attest the authenticity and historicity of Christ's miracles as recorded in the four Gospels. The testimony of the adversaries having been adduced to prove *the fact of miracles, confirmation* of their testimony by early Christians will be added, further to substantiate their historical occurrence.

1. Preliminaries respecting the miracles of Christ.
2. Witness of the enemies of the Christian religion.
3. Confirmation by the friends of Christianity.

PRELIMINARIES TO THE DISCUSSION.

a) By the word *miracle* is meant a fact or event made manifest to the human senses, wrought by the direct will and power of God, in the interests of Divine revelation. By its nature it belongs to the system of redemption, and can not be properly considered as a part of Christian evidence when sundered from its rightful place and relations. John Stuart Mill, himself an Atheist, wrote:

§124. Definition of Miracle.

“It is evidently impossible to maintain that if a supernatural fact really occurs, proof of its occurrence can not be accessible to human faculties. The evidence of the senses could prove this, as it can prove other things.”¹

Dr. Charles Hodge also remarks:

“The raising of Lazarus from the dead may be taken as an example. This was an event which occurred in the outer world; one which could be seen and verified by the testimony of the senses. It was not brought about either in whole or in part by the efficiency of natural causes. It was due to a simple word or volition or immediate agency of God. . . . So when Christ walked the sea, when he multiplied the loaves and fishes, when he calmed the winds and waves by a command,—any co-operation of physical causes is not only ignored, but, by clearest intimation, denied.”²

¹Three Essays on Theism, 217.

²Systematic Theol. I, 618.

β) Neither does a miraculous occurrence mean a *suspension, contravention, or violation of natural forces*; nor is it to be explained on natural principles or it would not be a miracle, since it arises outside of operations found in the system of nature. That is, though the natural forces remain uninterrupted in the exercise of their function, a different *effect* is produced by reason of a different and Divine Cause. When Israel invaded Canaan, the upper waters of the Jordan were stayed, and the lower waters flowed away. Now, nature's forces were never more powerfully active to cause the waters to flow as usual, but while the forces remained intact, the usual effect did not result, but was changed by the interposition of the Divine Cause. Cause and effect are to be discriminated. The effect of the force is not identical with the force itself, any more than the sound of an explosion is identical with the force which explodes.

Mr. David Hume, the famous disbeliever, catching the hint from Spinoza, followed his lead, and insisted that miracles were a violation of natural laws, and therefore incredible. He said:

“Miracles are violations of the laws of nature. But we learn from experience that the laws of nature are never violated.” “For miracles we have the questionable testimony of a few persons; . . . against them we have *universal experience*; therefore this stronger testimony nullifies the weaker and more questionable.” “It is a miracle that a dead man should come to life, because that has never been observed in any age or country.”

Thomas H. Huxley, the admirer and biographer of Hume, himself also a skeptic, thus exposes the sophistry and fallacies of these propositions:

“The definition of a miracle as a suspension or a contravention of the order of nature is derived from our observation of the course of events of which the so-called miracle is a part. On the other hand, no conceivable event, however extraordinary, is impossible; and therefore, if by the term miracles we mean only extremely wonderful events, there can be no just ground for denying the possibility of their occurrence.” “That is to say, there is a uniform experience against such an event,

and therefore, if it occurs, it is a violation of the laws of nature. Or, to put the argument in its naked absurdity, *that which never happened, never can happen without a violation of the laws of nature.*"³

Obviously it can not be claimed that a miracle is contrary to human experience, since all miracles constitute a part of that "*universal experience*" just the same as all other events.

Nor can the claim be justified that the disciples' testimony respecting miracles is inadmissible, as they do §125. The Disciples Witnessed His Miracles. not say themselves that they ever witnessed his miraculous works. The fact in the case is quite to the contrary. This is made sufficiently clear in the Scriptures.

a) John attests:

"There was a marriage in Cana of Galilee. . . . And both Jesus was called and his disciples to the marriage." Then follows the account of Christ converting the water into wine. "This beginning of miracles did Jesus in Cana of Galilee, and manifested forth his glory; and his disciples believed on him."⁴ "And many other signs did Jesus in the presence of his disciples, which are not written in this book; but these are written that ye may believe that Jesus is THE CHRIST, THE SON OF GOD."⁵ His miracles were not wrought in concealment, but openly before the public; for "A great multitude followed him because they saw the miracles which he did on them that were diseased;"⁶ and "Many believed on him when they saw the miracles which he did."⁷ But it is related in another instance that "Though he had done so many miracles before them, yet they believed not on him."⁸

β) Peter also witnesses:

"How God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Ghost and with power, who went about doing good, and healing all that were oppressed of the devil; for God was with him; and we are witnesses of all things which he did both in the land of the Jews and in Jerusalem."⁹

γ) Jesus himself declares:

"And ye also shall bear witness, because ye have been with me from the beginning."¹⁰ To some of the multitude whom he had fed, he said, "Ye seek me not because ye saw the miracles, but because ye did eat of the loaves and were filled."¹¹

³ Huxley's Hume, 158, 156.

⁷ Ib. ii, 23. ⁸ Ib. xii, 37.

⁴ John ii, 1, 2, 11.

⁹ Acts x, 38, 39.

⁵ John xx, 30, 31.

¹⁰ John xv, 27.

⁶ Ib. vi, 2.

¹¹ John vi, 26.

Now, it is a truth to be specially noted for its evidential value, *that no enemy of Christianity for the first four hundred years denied or made question of the fact that* §126. Miracles
 Stood
 Undenied. *Christ wrought miracles among the people.* This is true both of his contemporaries and their successors, whether Jew or heathen. This claim was assailed neither by Josephus nor Tacitus of the first century, nor by Celsus or Lucian of the second century, nor by Aurelian or Porphyry of the third century, nor by Hierocles or Julian of the fourth century, nor yet by the Jewish Talmud, whose writing was not concluded until the third Christian century. Upon the contrary, wherever they refer to Christ's miraculous works, they concede *the fact* without qualification, and in some cases they even mention the kind of miracle that was wrought. It certainly would have been of great advantage to those whose hostility led them to write for the very purpose of destroying Christianity, to have truthfully denied that which was made a standing challenge by both Christian apostles and apologists of the faith. How could this have been the case unless Christ's miraculous works were undeniably valid and historical? For adverse writers represented not only themselves, but also the Jewish or heathen populations behind them. They all realized and confessed that *something had occurred which they hoped to explain.* They therefore offered *their opinions* in explanation, that these miracles were works of magic, or jugglery, or of sorcery, or were attributable to the devil; conclusions not based upon investigation, but in accordance with their *prejudices*, and on a line with those deceptive arts with which they were most familiar. The Jewish adversaries, who were his contemporaries, and their successors, while they could not deny the fact of miraculous occurrences, were yet unwilling to allow that these were the signs of his Messiahship, and avoided and evaded that claim by imputing miracles to Satan. The record reads:

"The multitudes marveled, saying, It was never so seen in Israel; but the Pharisees said, By the prince of demons he casteth out demons."

“And he called them unto him, and he said unto them, . . . How can Satan cast out Satan? And if Satan also is divided against himself, how can his kingdom stand; because ye say that I cast out demons by Beelzebub, the prince of demons.”¹²

Dr. Philip Schaff has aptly remarked:

“The contemporaries of Jesus, his enemies as well as his friends, believed in his power of miracles, with this difference, that the one traced it to Satan, the other to God. Is it credible that John the Baptist, of whom no miracles are recorded, the twelve apostles, the seventy disciples, the learned and clear-headed Paul, the Evangelists, Nicodemus [of the Jewish Sanhedrin], the hostile Pharisees and Sadducees, the Sanhedrin [itself], and the common people in Jerusalem and the villages of Galilee, who witnessed his mighty works, should all have been radically mistaken? . . . To reject [miracles] imposes upon us the incredible belief that a whole generation of friends and foes were radically mistaken in a matter of common experience.”¹³

ENEMIES' WITNESS TO MIRACLES.

1. Josephus (b. 37), the famous historian of §127. Jewish Testimonies. the ancient Jews, bears witness unto Jesus to this effect:

“Now, there was about this time Jesus a wise man, if it be lawful to call him a man; for *he was a doer of wonderful works*, a teacher of such men as receive the truth with pleasure.”¹⁴

2. *The Talmud*. Both the Babylonian and the Palestinean Gemára in the *unexpurgated editions of Amsterdam in or prior to 1645*, contain brief but very malicious references to Jesus Christ and the apostles. The Gemára represents our Lord as the illegitimate son of Mary, a hairdresser, and a man called Stadia; that at one time Jesus visited Egypt, and there learned the arts of the magicians, which he afterwards practiced in Palestine, and that on this account as well as for leading Israel astray, the Jewish rulers caused him to be crucified. Respecting testimony of the Talmud, Dr. Philip Schaff remarks:

“We have here evidently a malignant perversion and indirect admission of the facts of the supernatural conception, the flight to Egypt, the miracles [of Jesus], and the crucifixion of our Savior.”¹⁵

¹² Matt. ix, 34; comp. Mark iii, 22, 23, 26; Luke xi, 15, 18-20.

¹³ *Person of Christ*, 97-99.

¹⁴ *Ant.* xviii, 3, 3. See also Appendix A.

¹⁵ *Person of Christ*, 195.

The Talmud reads:

“The Gemára contains this: A Tradition. R. [*i. e.*, Rabbi] Eliezer said to the wise men, ‘But did not the Son of Stadia bring magical arts out of Egypt, in the cutting of his flesh?’ The gloss says, ‘The reason for that [*i. e.*, the cutting of his flesh] was that he could not bring them away [in any other manner], that he might not carry out magical arts to teach them to men dwelling in other countries!’”¹⁶

3. *Toledoth Jeshu*, a very ancient rabbinical work, admits the fact that Jesus wrought miracles which it calls magic, and that he was well skilled in these arts. But it curiously ascribes his power to do such mighty works to the Incommunicable Name “*JEHOVAH*,” which, it states, was clandestinely obtained by him out of the temple; a name called by the Jews “*shem Hamphorash* ;”^{*} a word placed there by Solomon, which had been guarded there for a thousand years by two lions! The work further admits that—

“Jesus walked upon the sea, cured a leper, and raised the dead. It even goes so far as to describe that on one occasion the dry bones of a dead body were brought to Jesus out of a sepulcher, and he united bone to bone, clothed the whole with sinews, flesh, and skin, and the dead body stood upon its feet and lived again!”¹⁷

These admissions that Jesus did work miracles, found in Jewish literature, are mixed with such manifest perversions of fact and such puerilities of superstition as to seem almost incredible. Upon the other hand, there is no denial, but rather a positive assertion of the occurrence of miracles recorded by these adversaries, who even designate the kind of miracle which Jesus wrought. Now, if the mere tricks of the magician can actually cause a man to walk upon the sea amidst a tempest, can cleanse the leper, can raise the dead, then truly “magic” is but another name for miracle. “A rose is just as sweet by any other name.” But when did “magic” ever perform such wonders?

^{*} Derived from שם, name, and פָּרַשׁ the Pual participle of פָּרַשׁ to be declared. That is, the incommunicable name יהוה (*Jehovah*), which no orthodox Jew will pronounce correctly, ever remains to be declared [and is] incommunicable.

¹⁶ *Babyl. Tal., Sanhedr.* fol. 107, 6; *Schabbath* fol. 104, 2; *Soto* fol. 47, 1; also *Palést. Tal., Schabbath* fol. 13, 1; *Misch. Schabbath* fol. 4, 2.

¹⁷ Rabbi Frey, *Joseph and Benj.* I, 214.

To these testimonies of the ancient Jews may be super-added that of the modern Dr. Graetz, himself a Jew and the distinguished historian of the Jews. He says:

“The Christian chronicles abound in extraordinary events and descriptions of miraculous cures by Jesus. Though these stories may in part be due to an inclination to exaggerate and idealize, *they must doubtless have had some foundation in fact. Miraculous cures—such, for example, as the exorcism of those possessed of demons—belonged so completely to the personality of Jesus* that his followers boasted more of the exercise of that power than of the purity and holiness of their [own] conduct.”¹⁸

This frank concession of the historical fact that Jesus actually wrought miracles would be very admirable in the Jewish historian if it were not marred by a gratuitous reflection upon his followers, which evades the force of the fact admitted. For is it not quite obvious that if his disciples had “boasted” at all “of the purity and holiness of their [own] conduct,” it would have evidenced that they possessed neither? But the “conduct” of Christ’s disciples is altogether an admission that Jesus did actually work miracles.

§ 128. Philosophers’ Testimony.

4. Celsus (wrote 150):

“Jesus . . . having hired himself out as a servant in Egypt on account of his poverty, and *having there acquired some miraculous powers, on which the Egyptians greatly prided themselves, returned to his own country highly elated on account of them, and by means of these he proclaimed himself a God.*” But “these tenets of his were those of a God-hated sorcerer.”¹⁹ Christians also “deemed Jesus to be the Son of God because *he healed the lame and the blind.*” “Moreover, as you [Christians] assert, he raised the dead.”²⁰ Origen, replying, says: “Celsus . . . affects to grant that those statements may be true which are made regarding his cures, or his resurrection, or the feeding of a multitude with a few loaves, from which many fragments remained over,” and then he quotes Celsus as saying, “Well, let us believe that these were actually wrought by you.”²¹ “O light and truth! Jesus with his own voice expressly declares . . . that there will appear among you others also who will perform miracles of similar kind, but who are wicked men and sorcerers.”²²

¹⁸ *Hist. of the Jews*, I, 156, 157.

¹⁹ *Origen contra Celsum*, I, 28, 71.

²⁰ *Ib.* II, 48.

²¹ *Ib.* I, 68.

²² *Origen contra Celsum*, II, 49, 53; comp. Matt. xxiv, 24; Mark xiii, 22; 2 Thess. ii, 9, 10.

An analysis of Celsus's testimony yields the following concessions of fact:

1. He admits that Jesus actually did "acquire miraculous powers" in Egypt, though Christ then was but a babe!
2. Specifically he effected "cures," "fed the multitude with a few loaves," "healed the lame and the blind," and "raised the dead."
3. Nevertheless, these wonders of Jesus, so far from being miraculous, were the acts of no other than "a God-hating sorcerer."
4. That Jesus confessed that "wicked men and sorcerers" would arise and "perform miracles of similar kind" to his own.

Evidently these several propositions are incompatible with each other. For miracles can not at the same time be both true and false, actual and yet deceptive, causing "cures" of "the lame and blind," feeding "thousands with a few loaves," and yet be "the tenets of a God-hating sorcerer." Such, then, is the best and the worst that Celsus has to say of our Lord and his miracles. He obviously criticises these Christian tenets in an unscientific spirit, but in accordance with his own heathen prepossessions. Nevertheless, he does not, so far, evince that vicious disposition which was manifested by the Jews from whom Celsus is said to have derived much of his information respecting the early Christians. However, being a pagan and knowing nothing of miracles, he could not be expected to be prepared to believe them to be possible, much less to understand their purpose and place in the redemptive scheme of the Christian religion. It was quite natural, therefore, that he should identify miraculous occurrences with the tricks of impostors—jugglers, magicians, or sorcerers; arts which he knew the most about, though he wrote most about that of which he knew the least.

However, in this day these explanations of Celsus do not explain. No man of ordinary intelligence would willingly put

his reputation to the rack by the offer of a proposition against miracles as explained by the mere tricks of the magician. For is it not self-evident to any but the most superficial thinker that, if Jesus actually did walk upon the sea, cleanse the leprous, give sight to the blind, and raise the dead, these occurrences were in fact miracles, and so at a remove from the power and possibility of the impostor? Did a magician ever give sight to the blind, or raise the dead, or do anything whatever for the permanent good of men? If the miracles of Jesus were countless in number, and wonderful for variety, they were wrought in accordance with the more ancient prediction as the expected "signs" of his Messiahship. They were open to the scrutiny of the public, and witnessed by multitudes of people; they were attested under the investigation of the Sanhedrists; they were recorded by the Evangelists in the four Gospels without the slightest fear of contradiction, in the face of their worst foes—a constant challenge for all enemies to refute the high claim. With all this sanction and authority of Christian antiquity, the Church from the very beginning has affirmed that Christ's miracles were historical; and no enemy for four centuries either attempted to deny or refute the proposition.

But the citation from Christ made by Celsus that "wicked men and sorcerers" would arise, is an unfair representation of Christ's words. What Jesus said was that "there will arise false Christs and false prophets, *and they will show signs and wonders* [not 'miracles of similar kind,' as Celsus affirms], and they will lead astray, if possible, even the elect." Now, *the difficulty* involved in the representation of Celsus is not *etymological, but psychological*. It is not to be found in the meanings of the words "signs and wonders," but in the failure to make the intended application of the words. "For 'signs and wonders' may alike be properly applied to deeds whether good or evil. It is the *usus* which determines the application. We must take the writer's standpoint, think his

thoughts as he thought them, and take the same sense which he intended. Usually the context settles the meaning of an author. So in this Scripture. Jesus said in the good sense: "Except ye see signs and wonders ye will not believe."²³ At another time, using the same words in a bad sense, he says: "There will arise false Christs and false prophets, and will show [not the same, but] great signs and wonders, insomuch that, if it were possible, they would deceive the very elect."²⁴ They are the same words truly, but *not the same* "*signs and wonders.*"²⁵ The "signs and wonders" of the false Christ expressly "*deceive the very elect;*" the "signs and wonders" of the true Christ *confirm and establish the truth.* Deceitful signs never disprove the true signs which are miraculous, any more than the counterfeit disproves the genuineness of the true bank's issue. Jannes and Jambres, who withstood Moses before Pharaoh, *imitated* the miracles of Moses and Aaron, but finally confessed their failure, acknowledging that those of Moses and Aaron were wrought "*by the finger of God.*"²⁶ Paul also differences the signs which were true from those that were false when he refers to "the working of Satan with all power and *signs and lying wonders.*"^{*}

5. Porphyry (270), as reported by Colonia,

"Acknowledges that Jesus Christ is a man illustrious for piety, and that he is more powerful than Æsculapius and all the other [Greek] gods."²⁷

Æsculapius, in Greek mythology, was the god of the healing art. Hamann forcefully remarks, "Miracles can not be believed without a miracle." Probably they are inconceivable *à priori.* At least this testimony of Porphyry, while conced-

* An instance in point is the case of the famous, or infamous, Bar-Kokheba, "the son of a star," who succeeded in raising rebellion of the Jews against the Romans in A. D. 135, in the reign of Hadrian. "According to Jerome, this impostor pretended to vomit flames by means of a piece of lighted tow which he kept in his mouth!" After his capture and death, his followers called him Bar-Kozeba, "*the son of a lie.*"

²³ Σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα, John iv, 48.

²⁴ Matt. xxiv, 24; Mark xiii, 22.

²⁵ Σημεῖα μεγάλα καὶ τέρατα, Matt. xxiv, 24.

²⁶ Comp. Ex. viii, 18, 19, and 2 Tim. iii, 8.

²⁷ Cited by *Lard.* vii, 445.

ing so much from his standpoint, illustrates how difficult it is for an intelligent and honest heathen, as compared with an intelligent Jew, to understand and appreciate the value of a miracle, unless a miracle were wrought directly before his own eyes. He has never for a moment been in the sphere of the miraculous. He has no conception of a power above or apart from nature except the arts of the magician.

6. Hierocles (303) was one of the worst enemies that Christianity ever had to encounter. He was the instigator and director of the fearful persecution which raged in the reign of Diocletian and Maximian (303-306), when Christian churches were razed, the Scriptures burned in public, the Christians deposed from office, deprived of their civil rights, and compelled to sacrifice to false gods under penalty of death. Hierocles, so far from denying that Christ wrought miracles, admits the fact fully, but seeks to depreciate and disparage their evidential value by comparing them with fictitious tricks related of one Apollonius. He says:

“They are continually crying up Jesus for opening the eyes of the blind, and other like works. . . . But in the time of our ancestors, in the reign of Nero, flourished Apollonius of Tyana, who having, when very young, sacrificed at Ægis in Cilicia to that good god Æsculapius, wrought many and wonderful works. . . . We do not esteem him who did these things as a god, but a man favored by the gods; whereas they [the Christians] for the sake of a few tricks called Jesus God. . . . Christ, it seems, must be reckoned a magician, *because he did many wonderful things.*”²⁸

7. Julian (361) also bears an important, though unwilling, testimony to the miracles of Jesus. He admits that—

He “rebuked the winds, and walked on the sea, and cast out demons, and, as you will have it, made the heavens and the earth—though none of his disciples presumed to say this of him except John only, nor he clearly and distinctly. However, let it be allowed that he said so.” “But Jesus . . . having done nothing in his lifetime worthy of remembrance—*unless one thinks it a mighty matter to heal the lame and blind people, and exorcise demoniacs in the villages of Bethsaida and Bethany.*”²⁹

²⁸ Cited by *Lard.* vii, 478, 479, 476. ²⁹ *Ib.* vii, 627.

ANALYSIS AND SUMMARY.

An analysis of the testimonies of these Roman magnates is now in place. Hierocles concedes at least that "Christ must be reckoned a magician because he did many wonderful things;" and Porphyry confesses that he was "more powerful than Æsculapius and all the other gods" in these deeds; while Celsus frankly acknowledges that Jesus truly possessed "miraculous powers." The following persons designate the *kind* and *variety* of miracles wrought by Christ. Celsus affirms that Jesus "feeding the multitude with a few loaves," did "heal the lame and the blind," and "raised the dead," who also "made the heavens and the earth;" Hierocles, that he "opened the eyes of the blind, and other like works;" Julian, that he "rebuked the winds, and walked the sea, healed the lame and blind people, and exorcised demoniacs in the villages of Bethsaida and Bethany." These writers speak not only for themselves, but also for the great and intelligent populations behind them.

The *consensus* of these ancient adversaries is to the effect that, *as a fact, Jesus Christ actually wrought miracles.* But they felt that they must explain the fact; and their explanations of the power by which these effects were produced, differ. But miracles in their very nature are inexplicable. The fact conceded is one thing, and an adversary's conception of the fact is another. Besides, *opinions* are inadmissible as matters of evidences. To designate miracles as "few tricks," as Hierocles has done to minimize their force or character, does not make them tricks. To represent Jesus as "a God-hated Sorcerer" as Celsus does, is merely the heathen manner of explaining by calling names. Assertion is not proof. We are dealing now exclusively with the conceded fact as historical, that the Founder of Christianity wrought astonishing "signs and wonders" in vindication of his claim as the predicted Messiah and Redeemer of

§ 129. The
Roman
Testimonies.

§ 130. Heathen
Explanations.

the world. Jesus himself said: "Believe me that I am in the Father, and the Father in me; or *else believe me for the very works' sake.*"³⁰

It may be objected that these concessions were not made by contemporaries who were eye-witnesses of the miraculous events conceded. The reply is that, for the verification of history, it is not necessary that the historian himself should have witnessed the facts which he records in order to render them historical. But at the very beginning, on the birthday of the Christian Church, the apostle Peter vindicated the claim by his appeal to those who were contemporaries and witnesses of the events alleged, when he said to the gathered thousands at Jerusalem:

"Jesus of Nazareth, a man *approved of God unto you, by mighty works and wonders and signs, which God did by him in the midst of you, even as ye yourselves know, . . . whereof we all are witnesses.*"³¹

Such was but the beginning of the proof respecting the historicity of the miracles of Christ, and the continuance of the evidence by the testimony of enemies in the centuries succeeding is but a part of the history of the case; for it is to be remembered that miraculous occurrences were by no means limited to Christ's life. The apostles and their successors, in Christ's name and power, *continued* to work miracles for several centuries afterwards, until the Christian religion had demonstrated its own supernatural character; then the function of miracles had ceased, and they were retired from the world. Those ancient adversaries were the contemporaries of those miraculous events, and must be allowed to have testified advisedly in what they affirm; for how otherwise is it to be accounted for that those so hostile to Christianity came to have the conviction, and to make those concessions, were there no historical grounds for their belief? The conviction was there; and it is for him who rejects this explanation to furnish a better. How did the belief originate? And is it

§131. Objection Considered.

³⁰ John xiv, 11; comp. v, 36; x, 37, 38; xv, 24. ³¹ Acts ii, 22, 32. See also pp. 147, 148.

reasonable to suppose that these several adversaries arrived at the same conclusion respecting miraculous occurrences without any basis in actual facts? What but *the facts* gave rise to these heathen conceptions? It must be allowed that there was no felt necessity among them, except that imposed by history. They testify as independent witnesses, from different countries, in different centuries, in substantial agreement, in one conclusion. They affirm that Jesus rebuked the winds, walked the sea, fed the multitude, opened blind eyes, cleansed the leper, cast out demons, and even raised the dead to life. For what reason should such testimony from such sources go for nothing? What is the justifying ground for rejecting this testimony, except for the one reason that these adversaries of Christianity affirm occurrences which are recorded in the contents of the several Gospels? Much more discernment and character were requisite for such witnesses to yield credence to Christian miracles than are required now, at this distance of time, to deny their occurrence. The question of miracles is a matter of history, and should be treated in an historical spirit.

§ 132. Friends Confirm the Enemies' Testimony.

8. Origen (247): "The name of Jesus can still remove distractions from the minds of men, expel demons, and also take away diseases, and produce a marvelous meekness of spirit and complete change of character."³²

9. Tertullian (200): "As then under the force of their [Judaistic] prejudgment they convinced themselves from his lowly guise that Christ was no more than a man, as a necessary consequence it followed from that, they should hold him [to be] a magician, from the powers which he displayed; expelling devils from men by word, restoring sight to the blind, cleansing the leprous, reinvigorating the paralytic, summoning the dead to life again, making the very elements of nature obey him, stilling the storms, and walking on the sea; proving that he was the *Logos of God*."³³

10. Irenæus (177): "It is not possible to name the number of gifts which the Church throughout the whole world has received from God

³² *Contr. Cels.* B. 1, c. lxxvii.

³³ *Apol.* c. xxi.

in the name of Jesus Christ, . . . which she exerts day by day for the benefit of the Gentiles, neither practicing deception upon any, nor taking any reward from them. . . . Calling upon the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, she has been accustomed to work miracles for the advantage of mankind. . . . If therefore, the name of the Lord Jesus Christ even now confers benefits, and cures thoroughly and effectively all who anywhere believe on him . . . it is manifest that . . . [he] did all things truly through the power of God.”³⁴

11. Quadratus (125): “Our Savior’s works were always present; for they were real, consisting of those who had been healed of their diseases, those who have been raised from the dead, who were seen not only while they were being healed and raised up, but were afterwards constantly present [with the living]. Nor did they remain only during the sojourn of the Savior on earth, but also a considerable time after his departure; indeed some of them have survived even down to our own time.”³⁵

12. Arabic Writer (name and place unknown): “We know that the people called Christians founded their religion on parables and miracles.”³⁶

The important features of this testimony should now be carefully noted. Origen, in the middle of the third century, testifies that Christ’s power “still removed dis- § 133. Sum-
tractions of mind, cured diseases, expelled de- mary.
mons, and revolutionized character.” Fifty years earlier, Tertullian testifies that Christ “expelled demons from men, restored sight to the blind, cleansed lepers, reinvigorated the paralytic, making the very elements of nature obey him.” A quarter of a century still earlier, Irenæus relates how that “the Church throughout the world” received power from God “to work miracles for the advantage of mankind.” About fifty years yet earlier, in the first quarter of the second century, Quadratus mentions that persons then survived who illustrated “our Savior’s works,” men “who had been healed of their diseases,” and “those who had been raised from the dead.” And, finally, an unknown Arabic writer affirms that “the people called Christians founded their religion on parables and miracles.”

³⁴ *Adv. Heresies*, B. ii, c. 32, 4, 5.

³⁵ *Euseb. E. H.* iv, 3.

³⁶ MS. of Galen in Smith and Wace’s Dict.

These testimonies do more than *confirm* the adversaries' witness to miracles. They invariably ascribe the *continuance* of this imperishable power to Christ's own personality, as they were miracles wrought in his name. He endued his followers to do mightier works than those which he himself had done.³⁷ To realize the full force of these several attestations of friends and foes, their testimonies must not be taken separately, but together in combination, as the cable of power results from the union of the several strands composing it, which grapples the ship to shore.

³⁷ John xiv, 12.

CHAPTER VII.

CHARACTERISTICS AND VALUE OF CHRIST'S
MIRACLES.

- I. MIRACLES AS DISCRIMINATED FROM JUGGLERY.
- II. PLACE OF MIRACLES IN THE REDEMPTIVE SCHEME.
- III. MIRACLES AS CHRISTO-CENTRIC IN CHARACTER.
- IV. RELATION OF MIRACLES TO EPOCHS AND PROGRESS.
- V. EVIDENTIAL VALUE OF CHRIST'S MIRACLES.

CHAPTER VII.

CHARACTERISTICS AND VALUE OF CHRIST'S MIRACLES.

§ 134. Sources: Biographical Epitomes, and Literature.

1. JOHN CHRYSOSTOM (347-407), the celebrated "golden-mouthed" orator of the ancient Church, was a native of Antioch, Syria. He studied rhetoric in the school of the famous Sophist, Libanius, who deemed Chrysostom to be his best scholar, and desired him to become his own successor as Professor of Rhetoric and Eloquence. Afterward he studied philosophy and law. Abandoning these, he finally became a devout minister of Jesus Christ, and acquired the fame of being the most eloquent preacher in the ancient Church. In A. D. 398 he was appointed Patriarch of Constantinople, and had St. Sophia for his church. Living most abstemiously himself, he gave away his income to help the sick and poor about him, and was greatly revered. His purity of life, added to his remarkable exegetical abilities, gave him a thoroughly practical trend in his teachings. His courage to reform extended to the imperial court, whose vices he criticised publicly because publicly practiced. In consequence, he was banished by the Empress Eudoxia in the year 407. He died aged sixty. His best works are his sermons on Genesis, the Psalms, and Homilies on most of the New Testament. His published writings number thirteen volumes.
2. JOHN G. HAMANN (1730-1788) was a native of Prussia. He studied philosophy, philology, theology, and law. Somewhat eccentric, he designated himself "The Northern Magian," a title by which he is yet known. He found strong friends in such men as F. E. Jacobi, Berden, and Goethe. His miscellaneous writings were published in Berlin in 1821-1843, in eight volumes, which have attracted attention, especially since his death in Germany.
3. RICHARD ROTHE (1799-1867) was a theological student at Heidelberg. "He became successively a member, professor, director, ephorus [superintendent] of the Theological Seminary at Wittenberg." This was in 1828. In 1837 he was appointed professor of the Uni-

versity of Heidelberg, in 1849 in Bonn, and again at Heidelberg in 1854. He was prominent as a dogmatic and historical writer. Since his death his lectures have appeared, entitled *Dogmatik* (1870), and his *Church History* (1875).

4. JEAN PAUL RICHTER was born in 1763, at Wunsiedel, Bavaria; in 1781 he attended the University of Leipsic, and afterward in poverty became a teacher and author. He was remarkably brilliant. It has been said that "no writer has made such brilliant remarks, and no ten have made so many." His writings comprise sixty-five volumes.
5. THEODORE CHRISTLIEB (b. 1833) was a man of very remarkable genius and erudition. His birthplace was Würtemberg. He studied in Tübingen, taught in France, preached in London, and died in Prussia. He was Professor of Theology in Bonn. In 1873 he was a delegate to the Evangelical Alliance in New York, where he acquired great fame. In 1874, Dr. Christlieb published in English his great work entitled *Modern Doubt and Christian Belief*, consisting of eight lectures of a powerful apologetic character.

§ 135. Characteristics of Christ's Miracles.

I do not hereby deny in the least that God can do, or hath done, miracles for the confirmation of the Truth.—JOHN LOCKE.

With each miracle worked there was a truth revealed, which thenceforward was to act as its substitute; . . . for reason and religion are their own evidence.—COLERIDGE.

It is God's will by means of the miraculous to reveal to men who were blinded by sin.—R. ROTHE.

How did men ever arrive at the conception of a miracle if not through witnessing the workings of a Divine Omnipotence which was utterly beyond human comprehension?—ANONYMOUS.

Miracles can not be believed without a miracle.—HAMANN.

We have seen that Jesus Christ is the central miracle of history. . . .

The elimination of the miraculous element from the Gospel history can never take place without a deep injury or even a total destructive alteration of the entire substance of the Christian religion.—CHRISTLIEB.

'Ο Πατήρ μου έως ἄρτι ἐργάζεται, κἀγὼ ἐργάζομαι—"My Father worketh hitherto, and I work."—JESUS.

ARGUMENT.

Miracles, as the attesting signs of Christ's mission and truth proclaimed on earth, are to be justly discriminated from the vulgar pretense and arts of the magician, sorcerer, or juggler. The one is a *revealing act* to authenticate a given truth or fact invaluable to humanity; the other is a *concealing art* which practices deceit upon

the natural senses. Miracles are permanent in character and benign in results; sorcery is transient and trivial, and worthless throughout. So far from having anything in common, they have in history proved themselves antagonistic, in that miracles have opposed the magician's arts with a destructive energy, and the Scriptures not only denounce his procedures as impositions, but subjected the magician or sorcerer to punishment.

The miracles of Jesus are not to be characterized as mere abstract facts, casually introduced into Christ's life as having a temporary relation to his work. They belong to, and are identified with, the whole redemptive system of Christianity. Contemplated aright, they will be found to have been full of benignity and beneficence to men. *Miracles are a great factor and force in the restorative scheme of human salvation.* The words employed in the New Testament to express the idea of miracles are "*wonders,*" "*works,*" "*powers,*" "*signs.*" words so far as words can convey, not that which occurs on natural principles which can be explained, but that which supernaturally supervenes in attestation of Christ's work on earth, and to inspire faith in his restorative disposition and power. The miracles of the New Testament are strictly Christo-centric in character.

In God's progressive Revelation, miracles have an *epochal history*. They were initiative of new eras closely related to the spiritual condition and advancement of the Church. They served to inaugurate highly important movements and periods; and when the object of their existence was secured they were retired. Thus their evidential value is discoverable in the very structure and organization of the Christian system.

1. Miracles as Discriminated from Jugglery.
2. Place of Miracles in the Redemptive Scheme.
3. Miracles as Christo-centric in Character.
4. Relation of Miracles to Epochs and Progress.
5. The Evidential Value of Christ's Miracles.

A just distinction exists between the works known as miracles and the arts of magician or juggler. In the nature of the case it is not possible to make a scientific analysis of the internal laws and process which produce miraculous occurrences, for the insuperable reason that they are wrought by supernatural power, which is inscrutable. As was forcibly expressed by Schelling, "Nothing is more doleful than the occupation of all rationalists who strive to make that rational which declares itself above all reason." On the contrary, it is often difficult for a spectator

to detect and expose the arts of the magician or sorcerer, who conceals completely his methods. Externally, however, both may be known by their respective characteristics, trend, and effects. The better judgment of every intelligent person intuitively detects any sleight-of-hand tricks as a deception of the senses. Indeed, the fact is often avowed, and sometimes even exposed as a matter of pleasant entertainment, by the performer himself. But when one attempts to assume the rôle of the impostor, to represent in some sense the interests of religion, it appears in its worst possible form, as in the case of the so-called "spiritualism" which has been so repeatedly and completely exposed as an impious fraud.

From the time of Celsus until the present there has been a disposition, if not a determination, on the part of certain skeptics to identify miracles with the magician's or similar arts, when they could be easily refuted. This clearly betrays a want of insight into the real characteristics which discriminate the two. It is therefore worth while to compare them as to their trend and effects, and indicate what possible relation the one sustains to the other. This is discoverable in the point of contact, as has not unfrequently occurred in the history of miracles.

So far from miracles being one with sorcery, their attitude toward each other has been that of open hostility wherever they have been found in contact. They are the two camps of enemies at war. Sacred history records a standing protest against sorcery and all kindred arts. The Mosaic law not only denounces the practice, but provides for its instant punishment as frauds perpetrated upon the people.¹ Not unfrequently the worker of miracles was encountered in a given crisis with the false pretense and tricks of sorcery. As Jannes and Jambres withstood Moses when he wrought miracles in the presence of Pharaoh;² as the followers of the pagan god Baal publicly contested against Jehovah at Mount Carmel, each party calling down fire from heaven in turn, that the proposed offering

§ 137. The Two
Classes Dif-
ferenced.

¹ Ex. xxii, 18; Levit. xix, 26; Deut. xviii, 9-14.

² Ex. vii-xi; 1 Tim. iii, 8.

upon the altar might be consumed,³ so in the history of the New Testament some of the most formidable antagonists of the apostles and their work were sorcerers and exorcists. At Samaria,⁴ Philip the deacon encountered one Simon Magus, the magician of fame or infamy, who had acquired a great influence over the community; but no work of wonder is ascribed to his power, and he was admitted on repentance to the fellowship of the early Church. At Paphos, on the island of Cyprus, Elymas, a Jewish sorcerer,⁵ withstood Paul and Barnabas in the presence of the ruler, Sergius Paulus, when he was smitten with blindness for a time. At Philippi,⁶ a slave damsel "possessed of a spirit of divination," who brought her master great gains, on whom Paul wrought the miracle of dis-possession; for which the magistrates commanded Paul and Silas to be beaten and cast into the prison and their feet made fast in stocks. At Ephesus,⁷ certain "vagabond Jews, exorcists," undertook to work miracles over them who had evil spirits, in the name of the Lord Jesus, saying, "We adjure you by Jesus whom Paul preacheth;" but the man possessed leaped upon them and drove them out naked and wounded.

There is and can be neither identity nor resemblance where all is hostile. While the apostles wrought to dispossess and give liberty and comfort to the afflicted, the sorcerers were trying to retain in servitude the soul of the afflicted for the end of gains. The issue between them was complete. Accordant with the history of the facts is the teaching of Paul concerning "the working of Satan with all power, and signs, and lying wonders, and with all deceit of unrighteousness for them that perish." As remarked by the distinguished R. S. Poole, of the British Museum:

"As there is no evidence in the Bible of real results having been worked by supernatural agency used by magicians, we may draw the important inference that the absence of any proof in profane literature, ancient or modern, in no way militates against the credibility of the miracles recorded in Scripture."⁸

³ 1 Kings xviii, 17, *et seq.*

⁴ Acts viii, 5-13.

⁵ Acts xiii, 6-12.

⁶ Acts xvi, 16, *et seq.*

⁷ Acts xix, 13-19.

⁸ Smith's *Bible Dict.*, Hackett's ed., Vol. II, p. 1753, on "Magic."

From these facts several inductions are warranted, viz.:

1. Jugglers of whatever name—exorcists, sorcerers, magicians, witches, all meaning false arts with possible differences in pretense—*differentiate themselves in every induction.* stance of contact from the miracle-worker of the Scriptures by the very attitude they so naturally assumed toward real miracles, as well as by the arts in which they practiced impostures.

2. In spirit and purpose, which give character to the act, *jugglers were openly and absolutely hostile to the spirit and purpose of those who wrought miracles.* They are invariably found in contention against miracles.

3. *In every instance recorded of antagonisms between them, the sorcerer or magician took the initiative* in active opposition to the movements of the miracle-worker, and was crushed in his aggression.

4. The Scriptures repeatedly denounce the practices of the magicians as being criminal, and not only forbade the arts in Israel, but affixed to the law in the case the severest penalty for the punishment of the impostors.

5. Jugglery was as selfish and mercenary as it was sinful; upon the contrary, miracles were purely beneficent, without the hope of reward from any parties.

6. The arts of the juggler or sorcerer were practiced in part to exalt the performer in the esteem of the populace; but miracles were wrought in reverential spirit toward God, in entire self-abnegation, that men through the power of Christ might be brought to realize an endless salvation.

7. As miracles and sorcery differed in their character, so they differed in their results. The effects of sorcery were *invariably frivolous, degrading, and transient; the effects of miracles were invariably spiritual, elevating, and permanent.* In spirit, in purpose, in power, they differed at every point, and agreed in none.

So self-evident are these facts that an allegation which identified miracles with magic would expose the author to the suspicion of superficiality of mind, or downright perversity of judgment.

Dr. Christlieb remarks:

“The denial of miracles leads to annihilation, not only of Christianity, but of *all religions whatever.*” “Many are averse to the miraculous through fear of superstition. . . . In this they overlook the sharp discrimination of Scripture between belief and superstition, between miraculous power and witchcraft. Whereas the heathen sorcerer pretends to make the supernatural powers subservient to *his person*, the prophet or apostle, if he performs a miracle, accounts himself *only the instrument of God.* . . . *Only notice the noiseless unobtrusiveness of miracles in Holy Scripture, the chastity with which Christ sharply repels the vain curiosity and vulgar thirst of his age of wonders, and his frequent prohibition of their publication.*”⁹ “A glance at the internal evidences of truth in miracles, at the moral and religious character which reflects and serves, not only the power of God, but also his truth and holiness, and must prove pre-eminently their Divine origin, will show that it is not a very difficult task for one to defend his belief in Biblical miracles against the charge of superstition. It is a remarkable fact, however, that not the believers in miracles, but their deniers, fall most easily into superstition.”¹⁰

Dr. Schenkel observes that—

“When men no longer believe in God, they begin to believe in ghosts! In truth, there has scarcely ever been an age in which men have snatched more greedily after the extravagant than our own, which derides the supernatural.”¹¹

It must be remembered that, while a miracle touches without absolutely impinging upon natural forces, it has to do directly with man's internal and spiritual being. We err egregiously and undervalue the worth of miracles when we regard them as mere abstractions, apart from any internal relation to Revelation and Redemption. So far from being detached circumstances, they

⁹ Matt. ix, 30; xii, 16, 33, 39; xvi, 1-4, 20; Mark, i, 44; iii, 12.

¹⁰ *Mod. Doubt*, 287, 297, 298.

¹¹ *Was ist Wahrheit?* “*What is Truth?*” S, 22.

were facts incorporated into the redemptive scheme, as their internal character and trend imply. As Dr. Christlieb says:

“Not merely this or that *occurrence*, but the whole foundation of the Gospel history, that is the person of Christ itself, is intrinsically miraculous from beginning to end.” “For the elimination of the miraculous element from the Gospel history can never take place without a deeply-penetrating injury, or even a total and destructive alteration of the entire substance of the Christian religion.”¹²

In bodily derangements the remedies known to medical science restore to the normal condition of health and vigor. So the means employed in redemption contemplate man's spiritual restoration to the plan and plane of life intended by his Creator. This supposes a supreme loss by reason of his lapse through sin. Now, the miracles wrought upon mankind in the ministry of Jesus Christ were all in the direction of beneficence; were in trend *restorative* to the condition of ordinary life; and in so far they evidence their internal relation to the redemptive plan. When the blind were given their sight; when the lepers were cleansed from deadly malady; when the lame were conditioned anew to walk; when the deaf were enabled to hear; when the dumb had given them the power of speech; when the withered hand was restored whole like unto the other; when the sick were lifted from the couch into health; when the dead were raised to life again from the grave,—*every instance was of the nature of a restoration to the common estate of mankind*, proving both in function and effect that miracles were factors in the plan of redemption and credentials of the Divine Redeemer.

Miracles, in their restorative character which identifies them with a great organism, have not always received the consideration due to their claim. They have too often been treated as mere *single occurrences*, rather than as coherent parts of a great and beneficent system looking to the future life. Clearly miracles are not merely the accompaniments of a Divine message or of the Divine Messenger, but are an in-

¹² *Modern Doubt and Christian Belief*, 351.

tegral part of that organic whole which we call Revelation and Redemption.

In the historical New Testament *five* different words in Greek are employed to express the fact and function of miracles.* They are descriptive and interchangeable terms called "*signs*," as attesting Christ's Messianic character; "*wonders*," as related to him whose "Name shall be called *Wonderful*,"¹³ "*works*," demonstrative of the character of his kingdom; and "*powers*," with special reference to the spiritual forces employed to carry forward his gracious designs in human salvation.

§ 140. Terminology of Miracles.

In so far as miracles are Christo-centric, they are neither natural nor unnatural, but *supernatural*. Because supernatural in character, they are not to be placed in the category of things in nature, or to be judged by sensible standards. Miracles are facts to be attested through the senses by the judgment, yet as an appeal to our spiritual nature. They are for our help, but not subjected to our understanding. For even the forces of nature, such as gravitation and electricity, though known as facts and factors, are not in their nature understood. Miraculous occurrences

§ 141. Miracles as Christo-centric.

*Some examples as illustrations:

a. "*A Sign*" (σημείον, τό): "Master, we would see a sign from thee. (Matt. xii, 38.) "*Signs* upon the earth." (Acts ii, 19.) "This beginning of *miracles* did Jesus in Cana." (John ii, 11.) "This is again the second *sign* which Jesus did." (John iv, 54.)

b. "*A Wonder*" (θαυμάσιον, τό): "When the chief priests and scribes saw the *wonderful things* he did, . . . they were sore displeased." (Matt. xxi, 15.)

Also (τέρας, τό, "a Wonder"): "I will show wonders in the heaven above." (Acts ii, 19.) "Except ye see signs and *wonders*, ye will not believe." (John iv, 48.) "And many signs and *wonders* were done by the apostles." (Acts ii, 43.)

c. "*A Work*" (ἔργον, τό): "*The works* that I do in my Father's name, these bear witness to me." "Many good *works* have I showed you from my Father; for which of these do ye stone me?" (John x, 25, 32.)

d. "*Power*" (δύναμις, ἡ): "Whence hath this man this wisdom, and these *mighty works*?" (Matt. xiii, 54.) "He did not many *mighty works* there because of their unbelief." (*Ib.* xiii, 58.) "Jesus of Nazareth, a man approved of God unto you by *mighty works* (δύναμις), and *wonders* (τέρας) and *signs* (σημείον), which God did by him in the midst of you." (Acts ii, 22.)

¹³ Isaiah ix, 6.

are helpful for man's recovery from the deprivation and depravation which sinning has imposed upon human nature; being restorative, they hold an internal relation to Christ's kingdom on earth, and to that final consummation when "all things shall become new," and man restored shall appear in his ancient and original glory.

a) Accordingly, miracles appertain to the personality of Jesus Christ, whose "*signs*" and "*works*" they were, whose "*power*" and "*wonders*" centered in himself as their source. As Dr. Christlieb wisely remarks :

"Jesus Christ is the central miracle of history." "The person of Christ itself is intrinsically miraculous from beginning to end." "As a rule, anti-miraculists will not admit this. They imagine that miracles and the doctrines resting upon them, merely belong to the outworks of Christianity, and that, even if these fall, the essential, that is, the moral truths of Christianity, will still remain. I have already sought to show how perverted this conception of Christianity is. Christianity in its essence is not a definite quantity of moral truths or teachings, but a *series of facts*. It is Christ himself, his person and work, the religion of the incarnation of God in Christ, and the redemption of the world therein resulting. In other words, Christianity is essentially miraculous. Its Founder, in his personality as the God-man, is the Miracle of miracles. . . . Our Savior's earthly life and work from his sinless birth to his resurrection and ascension—all the chief facts of redemption—are nothing but miracles." "Miracles can be understood only in connection with the history of redemption."¹⁴

β) But the Christo-centric character of miracles in the Gospels will become the more evident as we contemplate them as having their center and source in Jesus alone. They were wrought by the exercise of his power. They were wrought by himself in person. They were wrought as credentials of his character and mission. They were wrought to advance the spiritual kingdom of which he was King. They were wrought in the interests of those who were his spiritual subjects. His Golden Rule was: "*According to your faith be it unto you: all things are possible to God.*"¹⁵ The final end was redemption, of which Christ was the Redeemer.

¹⁴ *Mod. Doubt, etc.*, 341, 286, 351.

¹⁵ Matt. ix, 29; xix, 26; Mark x, 27.

In the idea of redemption and restoration there is presupposed an original order of life and holiness which had been violated, involving a ruptured relation with God, and a lapse into a condition of helpless degeneracy on the part of the race. Sin checked the progressive development marked out in the creative plan as a scheme of living, introducing far-reaching disturbances, "and death by sin." It is not rational to believe that a God of infinite sympathies and affection would *not* seek to remove the disabilities entailed upon Adam's posterity at least, who had no part in the original transgression. Surely, if God should deliver his ancient people out of Egypt "by signs and wonders and by a mighty hand and an outstretched arm," so much the more would he seek to recover a whole fallen world from their spiritual bondage. As a part of the redemptive system, "miracles do not unnaturally break through nature, but supernaturally through the unnatural" and abnormal nature produced by sinning. Accordingly, Christ wrought miracles by his own inherent power as the Son of God; for he that said to the paralytic, "I say unto thee, Arise, take up thy bed and walk," said also to him, "Son, thy sins be forgiven thee."¹⁶

γ) Furthermore, in tracing miracles to their source and origin, it is to be especially noted that the apostles' miracles were wrought in the name of Christ. Their success was invariably ascribed to Jesus.¹⁷ On all occasions under examination they were careful to emphasize this fact. When they wrought the first apostolic miracle, on the lame-born at the Gate Beautiful of Jerusalem, Peter wrought it "in the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth." So far were they from attempting miraculous deeds in their own name or power, they expressly disclaimed such power in themselves. They said:

"Why fasten ye your eyes on us, as though by our own power or holiness we had made him to walk? . . . By faith in his name hath his name made this man strong, whom ye behold and know; yea, the

¹⁶ Matt. ix, 2-6.

¹⁷ Acts iii, 6, 12, 16; iv, 10, 16-19, 30; xvi, 18.

faith which is through him hath given him this perfect soundness in the presence of you all." Before the Sanhedrin Peter again said: "Ye rulers of the people and elders, if we this day are examined concerning a good deed done to an impotent man, by what means this man is made whole, be it known unto you all, and to all the people of Israel, *that in the name of Jesus of Nazareth whom ye crucified, whom God raised from the dead, even in him doth this man stand here before you whole.*" And when the Sanhedrists had conferred together privately, they said: "What shall we do with these men, *for that indeed a notable miracle hath been wrought through them is manifest to all that dwell in Jerusalem, and we can not deny it. But that it spread no further among the people let us threaten them, that they speak henceforth to no man in this name. And they called them, and charged them not to speak at all nor teach in the name of Jesus.*"¹⁸

These circumstances justify the belief that the miracles of the New Testament were Christo-centric and as such were incorporated into the redemptive scheme of Christ.

That miracles were epochal in character is made evident by their history. Abraham, the progenitor of the Hebrew race, § 142. *Miracles and Epochs.* was himself called to place and power in history through supernatural means, during that period which was characterized by theophanies and visions, which was a preparatory period for that of miracles. It extended distinctively from Adam to Moses who was the first miracle worker. As already seen, in cases of close contact between miraculous power and the powers of darkness, so far from collision there was collision, and the sorcerer was defeated in his opposition. This characteristic marks the development of the Jewish theocracy from the beginning. It illustrates what was so well said by Rothe: "It is God's will by means of the miraculous to reveal himself to men who are blinded by their sins." Whenever wickedness had gained an ascendancy over or within Israel, wonders and miracles were divinely interposed and wrought deliverance in the crisis. A new impulse was thus given to the theocratic government of God's people, and a new epoch was realized in the progress of their religious history. Hence, *miracles belonged to crises, and marked a new epoch in*

¹⁸ Acts iii, iv.

the course of the ancient faith, and produced a new advance in the spiritual life of the Church.

a) When Moses (B. C. 1500) effected deliverance from Israel's bondage in Egypt the first epoch of the miraculous began in the theocratic nationality. Pharaoh the oppressor with determination opposed the proposition offered him by Moses for the freedom of God's people, until the infliction of the ten plagues miraculously administered had wrought its work,¹⁹ and forced the obdurate and cruel ruler to yield, wisely though grudgingly, to the dictates of justice and judgment. Through miracles the rights of conscience and freedom of the oppressed were obtained. This was clearly in the direction of beneficence. Within three months, not only was the exodus of Israel accomplished without resort to battle with arms, but the Red Sea had been traversed dry-shod by Israel; and soon the dusky legislator of the mountain came forth from the face of God, bearing to his people that wondrous code of laws by which he organized more than half a million of slaves from Egypt into a formidable nation, destined to become the foremost religious nation of the ancient world. It is the same code whose principles are to-day wrought into the government of the very best and foremost civilizations of modern times. This was the beginning of a new epoch in the history of Israel.

β) The second period began in the time of the prophet Elijah²⁰ and Elisha, about B. C. 900, when a general apostasy from God prevailed. The people of Israel were rapidly becoming followers of the heathen god Baal, when miracles were again interposed, the kingdom recovered from its idolatry, and a new epoch in the religious life of the Jewish Church was begun. The crisis culminated on Mount Carmel; and its result seems to have made a lasting impression upon Israel; for after that event no more miracles were wrought until the time of Jesus Christ. There was much sinning and no little idolatry prac-

¹⁹ Ex. vii—ix.

²⁰ 1 Kings xviii.

ticed thereafter, which called, not for miracles, but for the more drastic measure of captivity for seventy years in Babylon. This wrought a permanent cure of Jewish idolatry. "The law and the prophets continued until John;" but the Baptist wrought no miracles.

γ) A new epoch opened with the coming of the "Man of Nazareth," who is described, by one who knew him well, as "a Man approved of God by mighty works and wonders and signs, which God did by him in the midst" of the people, which for magnitude and multitude had never before been known by mankind. But the Christian era was not introduced without witnessing the pre-eminent crisis brought about by the Jewish Church when it rejected alike his works and words, and crucified his person. Jesus had said unto them:

"If I do not the works of my Father, believe me not; but if I do, though ye believe not me, believe the works."²¹ "If I had not done among them the works which none other did, they had not had sin."²²

This stupendous manifestation of miraculous power on the part of Jesus prepared the people for the founding of the Christian religion, against which the very gates of hell have not been able to prevail. But this gift of power was transmitted to the apostles of Christ and the early Church to win and sustain their faith in Jesus in his absence, during the first centuries covering the ten great persecutions of the Christians. Then, when miracles had served the purpose of inaugurating epochal periods in certain crises of religious history; when Christianity had become established in the world, and reliance was effected and realized in the moral and religious faith and experience of men, miracles had done their appropriate work, and were retired. Thus, as marking special crises and inaugurating new epochs for the spiritual progress in religious history, miracles had their place, and did their work. As Coleridge has remarked with discrimination, "With each miracle worked,

²¹ John x, 37, 38.

²² *Ib.* xv, 24.

there was a truth revealed, which thenceforward was to act as its substitute, . . . for reason and religion are their own evidence."²³

Faith is justified by evidence. As free and rational beings we may be constrained to reason, but can not be forced to believe. Proofs are evidential, but not irresistible. "Whoever wills to doubt, can doubt." But in the presence of the sufficient reason, every rational being is responsible for his belief in that which he *ought to believe*, when he understands the case. Nevertheless, all evidences are not of equal worth. Miracles have their value evidently, but do not rank as the highest order of proof, nor yet as the lowest. Certainly they are not to be disparaged and discarded. They are lower in rank than the teachings of Jesus, yet higher than the testimony of John the Baptist respecting Christ, whose witness miracles progressively succeeded. They were especially adapted to the condition of mankind when Jesus appeared among men.

§ 143. Miracles
and
Evidence.

"Jesus said unto them, Except ye see signs and wonders *ye will not believe.*"²⁴ "Ye sent unto John, and he hath borne witness unto the truth. But the witness which I have is greater than that of John; the very works which the Father hath given me to accomplish, the very works which I do, bear witness of me, that the Father hath sent me."²⁵ "If I do not the works of my Father believe me not; but if I do, though ye believe not me, believe the works."²⁶ "If I had not done among them the works which none other [man] did, they had not had sin."²⁷ "Now, when he was at Jerusalem at the passover, during the feast, they believed on his name, beholding his signs which he did."²⁸

Obviously miracles were presented by Jesus himself, not as the highest order of evidence, but as that which was the best adapted to the times, and demanded by their condition, and intended as evidence to identify his Messiahship.

In matters of external evidence, as human nature is constituted, we are more powerfully impressed by that which comes to us by sensible demonstration, such as miracles furnish, than

²³ *Statesman's Manual*, Vol. I, 425.

²⁴ John iv, 48.

²⁵ *Ib.* v, 36.

²⁶ *Ib.* x, 37, 38.

²⁷ *Ib.* xv, 24.

²⁸ *Ib.* ii, 23.

by other methods of conviction; whereas "truth came by Jesus Christ," the highest authority, in the worthiest form. But the Jews rejected his teachings. We are prone to rely upon our senses for evidence, when God would have us believe him. "The Lord prefers a faith which believes without signs and wonders."²⁹ The disciple Thomas rejected the testimony of his brethren that they had seen the Lord after his resurrection, and he demanded both ocular and tangible proof as a condition of his believing. Jesus accommodated the case, as suffering a morbid condition of mind through the dreadful trial of the crucifixion; but Jesus instructed him that faith is better than sight: "Thomas, because thou hast seen me, thou hast believed; blessed are they that have not seen, and yet have believed."³⁰ In the winter, at the feast of the dedication at Jerusalem, Jesus was walking on the grounds of the temple when the Jews accosted him with:

"How long dost thou hold us in suspense? If thou be the Christ, tell us plainly." Jesus answered: "*I have told you and ye believed not; the works which I do in my Father's name, these bear witness of me.*"³¹ "If I had not come and spoken unto them, they had not sin; but now they have no excuse for their sin."³²

If miracles in the estimation and design of the Savior were not intended to stand alone as matters of evidence, but constituted a part of a system, they were certainly meant to be a power and have a place in Christ's kingdom. They had a direct relation to the person of Christ as credentials of his teaching and work. They revealed his identity and power. They all looked to the ultimate salvation and glorification of believers. When the Baptist had been long shut up in prison, but heard of "the works of Christ," not knowing whether the great miracle-worker was the one whom he had baptized, and of whom on sight he had borne witness, he sent two of his own disciples directly to Jesus with the inquiry; and Jesus identified himself to John's understanding by means of "signs."

²⁹ Köslin.³⁰ John xx, 29.³¹ *Ib.* x, 24, 25.³² *Ib.* xv, 22, 24.

“Go show John again those things which ye do hear and see: the blind receive their sight, the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, and the deaf hear, the dead are raised up, and the poor have the gospel preached to them.”³³

As credentials, miracles were employed by Christ to prepare the public mind for his teachings which thereby found acceptance. It was thus on “the third day” after their call, he wrought the first miracle in Cana of Galilee, “and his disciples believed on him,” in consequence.³⁴ With the apostles, however, miracles were *secondary to the word, and confirmatory of their preaching*. Accordingly, as we have it in Mark’s Gospel, Jesus himself said: “And these signs shall follow them that believe.” “And they went forth and preached everywhere, the Lord working with them, and *confirming the Word by the signs following*.”³⁵

§ 144. Inductions.

1. Miracles externally are distinguished from incantation and every form of deception by their mutual antagonism found in every instance of contact in history.
2. Miracles internally constitute an integral part of the Christian religion, being inseparable from, and having to do directly with, the redemption of mankind.
3. Miracles at once evidence and illustrate the Divine claims and character of Jesus Christ as the Messiah touching his mission on earth as the Savior of men.
4. Miracles are Christo-centric, because he is the Source and Center of this outreaching power unto men, and after him, his apostles wrought miracles in his name.
5. Miracles serve not only to characterize special crises in religious history, but distinguish new epochs in the progress of God’s Church on the earth.

³³ Matt. xi, 2-5; Luke vii, 19-22.

³⁴ John ii, 1-11.

³⁵ Mark xvi, 17, 20.

CHAPTER VIII.

MODERN OBJECTIONS TO THE HISTORICITY
OF MIRACLES.

I. HISTORY OF THE NEGATION OF MIRACLES.

Chubb—Spinoza—Hume—Strauss—Rénan.

II. MIRACLES AND THE ABSOLUTISM OF NATURE.

1. *The Idea of a Miracle.*
2. *The Absolutism of Nature.*
3. *Nature and our Knowledge.*
4. *Absolutism a Fiction.*
5. *Nature's Laws Modifiable.*
6. *Nature's Laws Antagonistic.*
7. *Creation and Science.*
8. *Origin of Life on Earth.*
9. *A Personal God and Nature.*

III. MIRACLES AND UNIVERSAL EXPERIENCE.

1. *Terms Universal Experience of Mankind Defined.*
2. *Miracles Included as a Part of Universal Experience.*

IV. MIRACLES AND INVESTIGATION.

1. *David Strauss and Investigation.*
2. *Ernest Rénan and Investigation.*



CHAPTER VIII.

MODERN OBJECTIONS AGAINST CHRIST'S MIRACLES.

§145. Sources: Biographical Epitomes, and Literature.

1. ALEXANDER VON HUMBOLDT (1769-1859), of Berlin, a scientist of pre-eminent abilities, acquirements, and skill. His *Kosmos* (in 4 vols., 1845-1859) was his greatest work, scientific in character but popular in style; a work which would immortalize any man. It has been described as his "chief work, the most perfect and the most characteristic." "It is a wonderful book, stupendous in its learning and admirable in its ease." (Peterson.) "With him ends a great period in the history of Science; and that was his peculiarity; he was the end of the period, not the beginning." (Agassiz.)
2. SIR CHARLES LYELL, of Scotland (1797-1875), a graduate of Oxford, England, in 1819, studied law, but, from inclination and taste, devoted himself to enthusiastic pursuits, especially geology, in which he became pre-eminent. He published his *Principles of Geology* (3 vols., 1830-1833), which soon became a standard authority. In 1832 he was chosen Professor of Geology at King's College, London; became president of the Geological Society in 1836, and again in 1850. In 1863 he published his *Geological Evidences of the Antiquity of Man*, in which he supported the "*Darwinian Theory*" of the *Origin of Man*.
3. JUSTUS VON LIEBIG (1803-1873), a native of Darmstadt, Germany, was educated at the University of Bonn and Erlangen, and became Professor of Chemistry at the University of Giessen and Munich. He was chosen president of the Academy of Science at Munich in 1860, and was made a member of the Academy of Sciences at Paris in 1861. Humboldt became his friend, and he was recognized in the world of science as the greatest chemist of his time.
4. JAMES B. MOZLEY (1813-1878) graduated at Oriel College, Oxford, in 1834; became Canon of Worcester in 1869, Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford in 1871, and was author of several works of note, among which was *Eight Bampton Lectures on Miracles* (1865).
5. W. B. CARPENTER (1813-1885), an eminent English physiologist, Professor of Medical Jurisprudence in the University College, Lon-

don, and editor of the *British and Foreign Medico-Chirurgical Review*. "He had few living equals in acquaintance with natural science for original inquiry and skill as a scientific writer." He was chosen president of the British Association for the Advancement of Science in 1872.

6. J. J. VAN OOSTERZEE (1817-1882), born at Rotterdam, Holland; educated at the Dutch University of Utrecht; was chosen Professor of Systematic and Practical Theology in the same institution in 1862. He wrote a number of works of great value, among which are a *Life of Christ* (1865); *Christian Dogmatics* (2 vols., transl., 1870); *Theology of the New Testament* (1867); and an Essay before the Evangelical Alliance at New York, in 1873, on *Gospel History and Modern Criticism*. These are all works of rare worth, profound thought, and admirable scholarship and skillfulness.
7. JOSEPH ERNEST RÉNAN (1823-1892), of France, distinguished as a philologist and an anti-Christian writer. After winning several minor distinctions, he was sent by the *Académie des Inscriptions* on a literary tour through Italy, of which he was elected a member in 1856; was honored with a scientific mission to Syria in 1860-1862; then chosen Professor of Hebrew in the *Collège de France*, which position he soon lost by the publication of his *Life of Jesus*. He was, however, reinstated in 1870, and was chosen a member of the *Académie Française* in 1870. Rénan died October 2, 1892. He is most widely known in the literary world by his works entitled *Origines du Christianisme*, *Vie de Jésus* (1863); *Les Apostles* (1866); *Saint Paul* (1867); *L'Anti-Christ* (1873); and *Marc Aurele* (1881). His best work was *Historie generale des Langues Semitiques*. His style was brilliant and beautiful, but the contents are too imaginary and his postulates relating to the Christian religion too gross in the perversion of facts to find acceptance among critical thinkers. Criticism has relegated his anti-Christian writings to the realms of romance as being utterly unreliable and unhistorical.

§ 146. Modern Objections to the Historicity of Miracles.

1. The right to deny *à priori* the possibility of a miracle—if at least one believes in a personal and living God—has never yet been proved.—VAN OOSTERZEE.
2. No one is in a position to declare that there is no power adequate to the production of miracles, neither can he affirm them to be inconsistent with Divine Wisdom and Almighty Power.—WATSON.
3. I will frankly confess that, up to this hour, I have never been able to discover a stumbling-block for my intellect in the conception of miracles.—ROTHER.

4. It is, and always has been, a favorite tenet of mine, that Atheism is as absurd, logically speaking, as Polytheism; and that denying the possibility of miracles seems to me as unjustifiable as speculative Atheism.—HUXLEY.
5. The common attitude toward miracles is not that of doubt, of hesitation, of discontent with existing evidence, but of absolute, decisive, and even unexamining incredulity.—LECKY.
6. Miracle comes into collision only with the pretended absolutism of natural laws, and the idolatry with which Atheism regards it.—BRUCE.

ARGUMENT.

The negation of the miracles of Scripture belongs to modern history. Most objections relate to the absolutism of natural forces and laws, an unproved postulate. Thence it is inferred that a miracle is "a violence to nature's laws," "a rent in nature's system." The most recent theories in opposition to the miraculous are two: that they were occurrences which had their origin in ancient myths believed by an ignorant and superstitious people, or that they were at first the merest legends based on natural facts, but exaggerated by early accretions, and traditionally transmitted to us. Therefore miracles, as such, are imaginary; they never had an actual existence; they were never subjected to critical investigation.

These objections to miracles are not shown to have a foundation in facts, are unsupported by proofs, and, indeed, have no existence except in the credulity of the objector. Every shift of the ground for objection is itself a confession that the older position was untenable and is abandoned. It is an opposition based upon an *à priori* aversion respecting the miraculous, which is unscientific in character and precludes investigation. The idea of a miracle is not that of the suspension of a natural force or law, much less its violation; but, leaving the natural in full and active operation, a different effect is produced by the introduction of the direct power of God, which is the projection of a Higher Law. Nor can a miracle be called "an after-thought with God" to correct an imperfect creative plan of the universe, but God's forethought to rescue man from his abnormal condition in consequence of his having sinned. It is clearly the right which inheres in God as the law of his Almightyness to exert his power to that wisest end of restoring his people from sinful wretchedness to that plane of life originally contemplated in man's creation.

1. History of the Negation of Miracles.
2. Miracles and the Absolutism of Nature.
3. Miracles and Universal Experience.
4. Miracles have not been Investigated.

THE HISTORY OF THE NEGATION OF MIRACLES.

There was no denial of miracles during the first four Christian centuries. Upon the contrary, the fact of such occurrences was fully admitted, the kind of miracles wrought were designated, and the apostles who wrought them were mentioned by name by the early enemies of the Christian religion. The history of the negation of miraculous occurrences began about two centuries and a quarter ago. The Deists of Great Britain were the first to hold that miracles were unnatural, unhistorical, impossible. Thomas Chubb, a leader in the opposition, admitted that certain remarkable occurrences did actually happen, but that, in his opinion, they were all base deceits and impostures. Benedict Spinoza, the Jew, boldly contended for the absolutism of nature, on the hypothesis that, nature being a perfect and an immutable organization, miracles must be excluded as an innovation. He said:

“The laws of nature are the only realizations of the Divine Will; if anything in nature could happen to contradict them, God would contradict himself.”

David Hume, in his celebrated *Essay on Miracles*, taking the hint from Spinoza, followed his trend, and insisted that miracles were a violation of natural laws, and therefore incredible. He attempted to refute the proposition of their occurrence on the ground that—

“Miracles are a violation of the laws of nature. But we learn from experience that the laws of nature are never violated.” “For miracles we have the questionable testimony of a few persons; . . . against them we have universal experience; therefore this stronger testimony nullifies the weaker and more questionable.”

Then afterward, as Natural Science enlarged and explored its domain, not Science itself but certain scientists, looking exclusively upon the system of nature, became incorrigible

materialists, and disallowed the Supernatural place and power in the universe. More than sixty years since, David F. Strauss, of Germany, affirmed, in his *Life of Jesus*, that all the miracles of the New Testament were resolvable into mere myths, as being figments of the ancient imagination. Now, "a myth is a representation of a religious idea or truth in the form of a fictitious narrative."¹ He did not deny the historical existence of Jesus Christ, but rather admitted that he did exist and that he was a man of rare genius; yet all that was claimed as supernatural in Christ's birth and person, and all that is narrated as miraculous in his history, he held to be imaginary representations of religious ideas, and not facts, honestly believed by the Evangelists, but without historicity. Proofs he did not offer to substantiate his position. This would indeed have been the easiest possible disposition to make of the case, if it is allowable to settle anything in reasoning by merest assertion, and ignore the facts. But he preferred to reflect offensively on the understanding of those who differed from his own judgment, and assume the point to be proved. He said: "The chief offense which the old system of religion necessarily gives to the spirit of our age is its superstitious belief in miracles."² Strauss's postulates have been refuted again and again, both by his own countrymen and by critical scholars in Great Britain and America. Finally, Joseph Ernest Rénan of Paris, professor in the College of France, was pleased to believe that the stories of the miracles were legends; accounts containing a small amount of history, with an enormous amount of fiction. However, this writer's utter disregard of the facts of sacred history was so phenomenal when they were against his hypothesis, and his facility in substituting his own imagination for facts was so great, that his critics assign his writings to the department of "romance." Such is the history of the modern opposition to miracles.

¹ See Schaff's *Person of Christ*, pp. 170, 171, 115-118. ² *Leben Jesu*, p. 18, 1864.

MIRACLES AS A VIOLATION OF NATURE'S ABSOLUTISM.

It is important to the discussion of this chapter that the following distinctions should be kept carefully in sight. The line is clearly drawn between the *natural and the supernatural* as involved in miracles. The natural is the universe and its processes; the supernatural is God and his procedures. The two are to be discriminated in thought as in fact, as the Creator is distinguished from his creation, as cause is distinguished from its effect. All we know of the *natural* is knowledge derived through the five senses; all we know of the *supernatural* is derived through revelation, whether of works or word. By the *laws of nature* is meant simply that regular method which we observe, in which certain phenomena follow certain causes which are called forces. By the *absolutism of nature* is meant the proposition which holds that the universe is absolutely perfect in its organization and laws, and is absolutely independent and free from all control whatsoever. This rules out God as the Ruler of the universe. The Atheist John Stuart Mill wrote:

“The expression *Law of Nature* is generally employed by scientific men with a sort of tacit reference to the original sense of the word *law*; namely, the expression of the will of a Superior—a Superior in this instance being the Ruler of the universe.” “The expression *Laws of Nature* means nothing else but the uniformities which exist among natural phenomena; or, in other words, the result of induction, when reduced to their simplest expression.”³

The famous scientist, Dr. W. B. Carpenter, of Great Britain, states:

“It must be clearly understood that science is nothing more than man’s intellectual representation of the phenomena of nature, and his conception of the order of the universe. That conception is formulated in what we term the laws of nature, which in their primary sense are simply the expression of the phenomenal uniformities, having no coercive power whatever. To speak of such phenomenal laws as governing phenomena is altogether unscientific.”⁴

³ *Logic*, Bk. iii, c. 4.

⁴ *Principles of Mental Philosophy*, p. 692.

A miracle is a *supernatural* occurrence. It is not effected by nature's laws; it is not accordant with nature's laws; it is not contrary to nature's laws; it is not a violation of nature's laws. All these are fictitious conceptions of the miraculous. To be evident to the senses, a miracle must touch upon some object in nature, or it could not be manifest. It is brought to pass by the direct exertion of God's power for the good of man. Being the introduction of a new force, it produces a new effect, differing from that produced by nature's forces. The forces of nature were never more free and urgent in activity than when a miracle was wrought; but in such case the natural law did not produce its natural effect. When Joshua's hosts crossed the river Jordan from the east to invade Canaan, by a miracle the waters above were "cut off," or stayed, and the waters below flowed away, so that Israel passed over dry-shod. Now, so far from there being a suspension of the natural forces or any interference with their exercise, those forces were never more powerfully exerted than then, but *another effect was produced by the introduction of another Cause*. That is, there was a direct causation from God in the interests of a wise and beneficent purpose toward man. The transaction took place outside of the organism of nature as to its source and power; but there was no "violence" done to nature, as was assumed by Hume, and no "rent" perceptible, as asserted by Strauss.

That which is most accentuated by the contestants of miracles is, that nature's forces and laws are absolute and immutable; that, as a system, it is absolutely perfect, unalterable, and inviolate. This postulate necessitates the exclusion of the living and personal God. It assumes that, in God's creating nature, he limited himself in his own freedom, and ceased to be infinite by such limitation. The universe is absolutely independent of God, and warns off the Creator. Miracles are impossible. Of course, this is sheer assumption.

§149. The Idea of Miracle.

§150. Nature's Absolutism.

Unquestionably, in many aspects of phenomena which fall under our observation, there is discernible a constant uniformity in what we call the active operation of nature's laws. But we do not know, and no one pretends to know, universal nature; and there is in what we know no warrant for believing that the regularities which we observe furnish ground for the exclusion of miracles. It can not be claimed that we have a right to know that the natural activities are always and everywhere the same in regularity. Those who have most emphasized the absolute immutability and inviolability of the universe and its processes, have failed to tell just what the laws of nature are, and why miracles would be debarred because deranging or violating natural laws. Without knowing precisely what the laws of nature are, how can we know what will violate them? In the absence of any justifying reasons for such belief, the claim must be attributed to mere prejudice in advance of investigation, which is not scientific.

Every intelligent mind acknowledges the obvious fact that our knowledge of nature and its processes is
 §151. Nature and Knowledge. yet extremely limited in comparison with what is unknown. X. Bichat, of France, recognized as one of the most eminent physiologists of the past century, says:

“The vital properties are at every instant undergoing some change in degree and kind; they are scarcely ever the same.” “They are subject to a number of varieties; they baffle all calculation, and would require as many formulæ as the cases which occur. In their phenomena, nothing can be foreseen, foretold, or calculated; we judge of them only by their analogies, and these are in the vast proportion of instances extremely uncertain.”⁵

Sir Charles Lyell also observes:

“To say that such leaps as have received the name *Atavism* [*i. e.*, the tendency in generation to return to original species or type] constitute no interruption of the ordinary course of nature, is more than we

⁵ *Anatomie Generale*, Introd. p. xx1.

are warranted in affirming. In the case of the occasional birth of an individual of superior genius, there is certainly no break in the regular genealogical succession; . . . still a mighty mystery remains unexplained; and it is the *order* of the phenomena, and not *its cause*, which we are able to refer to the usual course of nature."⁶

It is further affirmed by the distinguished Rev. H. C. M. Watson, of New Zealand—

“That the operations of nature have never varied is a proposition that can not be maintained. A process of necessary reasoning compels us to believe that they have varied in the past history of the world. The science of Geology witnesses to the truth of this position.”⁷

From all the foregoing citations, taken from scientists and authorities of the first order, the following facts are derived as the basis of further discussion:

1. The Laws of Nature are nothing else than the expression of uniformities of phenomena.
2. Vital properties in nature are every instant changing in both degree and kind.
3. Interruptions in the course of nature called *Atavism* are by no means uncommon.
4. Geology witnesses to the fact that the operations of nature are certainly variable.
5. To speak of phenomenal laws as coercive or governing phenomena is unscientific language.

These facts evidence that no man is entitled to affirm that natural laws are absolutely regular and immutable, that miracles should be excluded, as claimed by Hume § 152. Absolutism a Fiction. and his admirers. Upon the other hand, if, as Dr. Carpenter says, “Science is nothing more than man’s intellectual representation of the phenomena, and his conception of the order of the universe,” and “simply the expression of the phenomenal uniformities, having no coercive power what-

⁶ *Antiquity of Man*, c. xxiv.

⁷ Paper read before the Victoria Institute, or the Philosophical Society of Great Britain, Vol. XX, p. 224.

ever," what is the ground on which miracles are excluded? If Bichat's statement is indisputable, that *vital* properties are "every instant undergoing change, both in degree and kind," what is to be said of physical nature outside of the vital? Geology witnesses that invariability in the operations of nature can not be maintained. What is to be said of those meteoric showers whose irregular occurrence is always taking the world by surprise? Such displays do not come regularly or constantly. Why, then, should they occur at all under a system of laws which is absolutely immutable? What do we know of the hidden causes and conditions lying back of the phenomena by which are produced *occasionally* destructive cyclones, terrible earthquakes, and volcanic eruptions—occurrences which come without uniformity, and are surprises in time and procedure? Do they not demonstrate changeableness in both the forces and phenomena of nature? If these things do not happen at regular intervals, that fact itself denotes deviation instead of immutability in nature. If variability and deviation are found in the causes and conditions, as well as in time and the mode of procedure, then variability and deviation lie at the very fountain-head of nature's laws, and refute the claim that nature is and always has been uniform and changeless. In short, the absolutism of nature's laws is a purely fictitious claim. No one is warranted in denying the possibility of miracles on the ground of the immutability and inviolability of nature's laws.

M. Compté declares that "the human intellect is subject to the law of an invariable necessity which is demonstrable *à priori* from the nature and constitution of the intellect." On the other hand, Huxley indignantly denies the postulate, affirming that, "as a matter of fact, the intellect of man *has not been* subjected to the law," as claimed!⁸ Here are two disbelievers in Christianity antagonizing each other as to the existence of a law of nature claimed to be demonstrable.

⁸ Huxley on Hume.

It clearly can not be maintained that nature is absolute, so that any interference or modification is impossible or would be a violence which would shock the universe. This is perfectly demonstrable, and is done every day. ^{§ 153. Nature's Laws Modifiable.} The fact is not to be denied that the lower forces of nature are constantly counteracted and modified by those which are higher; the mechanical by the chemical, the chemical by the vital forces.⁹ In such cases it is not correct to say that the feebler force is in any sense suspended or annihilated; rather it becomes co-operative in securing ends not attainable by itself. The higher laws or forces are constantly modifying the lower ones in the system of nature, to our greatest advantage, and this modification and counteraction are also employed in the mechanical arts. This principle may be variously illustrated.

A seed germinates in the soil, developing a vegetable organism above ground; the animal consumes the vegetable organism and man consumes both the animal and the vegetable organisms; but where is the shock administered in the universe? Through long days and nights the tree holds out the fruit on its tireless limb, in constant exposure to the sun's light and warmth, to secure the silent chemistry which makes for its proper development and ripeness. Meanwhile gravitation grapples and tugs with all its inherent power to draw the fruit down to earth; but a stronger force of adhesion holds the fruit fast in the grasp of the tree, until the ultimate end is accomplished. By due process, the adhesive force weakens its grasp, and the stronger force overcomes, and the fruit at length descends into the lap of earth. In this battle of the forces there is mutual victory and defeat; but there is neither "violence" nor "shock" to the laws of nature. An artisan's skill places overhead the ceiling of a room, and ever afterward, without an instant of break, the force of gravitation is tugging at every square inch of that broad ceiling; but gravi-

⁹*Lay Sermons*, pp. 156, 157.

¹⁰ See Murphy on *Habit and Intelligence*, I, 88.

tation is again overcome by the stronger force, permanently, without the slightest evidence of shock or violence. A magnet attracts iron filings, and holds them aloft despite the drawings of gravitation; the greater force overcomes the weaker force. It is natural for water to run downhill; but, by means of the siphon, man compels it to run uphill. These are not miracles; but they refute the claim that the laws of nature are absolute, and admit of no modification or change without violence. So man at his will controls *the effect* of natural forces wherever he employs steam to traverse the ocean, or uses electricity to propel the trolley-car. The higher force of man's will puts the other natural forces to a new purpose. But no law is suspended; nothing is done contrary to nature; but *a new effect is produced*. *If a man can do so much, how much more the will and power of the infinite God!* It is the admirable remark of Dr. Schaff: "The control of nature by the will of man is no miracle, but it involves all the speculative difficulties which are urged against it by materialists and Atheists."

But there is still another aspect of the case which challenges consideration. As already seen, the miracles of Christ were restorative* in trend and effect. When the yellow fever begins its ravages in a given community, all the remedies known to the healing art are invoked to stay its destructive work and exterminate the ghastly evil. Here is an antagonism in the forces of nature, between the forces of life and the forces of death. Is this very antagonism to be cognized as a part of nature's supreme perfection and immutability, that its harmony would be disturbed and rent by the performance of a miracle to the same end? Recovering from a deadly disease means the recovery of man from his abnormal to his natural condition. There are laws which are promotive of life and health; and there are laws which are promotive of disease and death; and these are

§ 154. Nature's
Laws An-
tagonistic.

* See chap. vii, § 139.

contrary the one to the other. If there are maladies to be suffered, there are also remedies for our restoration. If, now, it be claimed that all these instances cited merely illustrate a normal state of facts in the natural law, in which one force operates to overcome another force which is resistive, and that the system of nature includes all such modifications and antagonisms in its legitimate workings, then in what consist this absolute perfection and harmony, in distinction from derangement and discord, that miracles should be excluded?

But now let the claim be admitted. Then three facts are to be carefully noted: (1) It is a surrender of the contention that any modification or interference with the ordinary activities of natural forces is a violence or outrage to nature. (2) It legitimates the question, If man interfere with and modify the action or results of natural law, as he certainly does, how and why is it impossible for the Infinite God to do so likewise? (3) It prepares the way for the distinct assertion that miracles can in no proper sense be affirmed to be violative of natural forces. Rather, they are analogous to the healing art. They are beneficent in purpose. They contemplate restoration to the creative plan of life for man.

In order that this objection against miracles shall have validity at all, it must be assumed that nature is now, as ever since creation, in its normal condition of absolute perfection and immutability which miracles would violate. But evidently natural phenomena do not always prove that that condition exists. For there are natural laws of § 155. Laws of Contrariety. contrariety and antagonism which must be taken into the account. As already seen, there are forces which are constantly at war. When volcanoes disgorge their fires, whole cities are overwhelmed with destruction and desolation, as were Pompeii and Herculaneum before Mount Vesuvius in A. D. 79. When earthquakes rock the globe, calamity and waste follow in the track. Famine stalks the land, peering into every hut and palace, only to fill the land with distress. Pestilence breathes

across continents, and whole populations disappear from the earth. There are laws which are instinct with the power of life and happiness, and there are laws which are instinct with the power of death and wretchedness. How do all these miseries experienced—mental, moral, and physical—these laws of contrariety and absolute antagonism, illustrate and prove the absolute perfections and harmonies of nature? In all this silent war of forces which fill the air and earth, why should it be thought that miracles, which come to our relief, bringing beneficence to cure some of our worst evils, should be excluded? Is it a rational belief that the world should be kept in an abnormal condition of suffering; that men should have eyes without sight, ears without hearing, hunger without food, life without health, mind without reason, when miracles come to relieve and restore the afflicted to the common condition of mankind? Is it rational to impute violence to the Lord of life, who, with that sweetness of spirit which has never been paralleled by any mortal man, when moving among the lowly and wretched of our race to relieve them of their unnatural burdens of life; so that, at his touch the sightless eyes began to see; at his word the speechless tongues began to speak; at his command the loathsome leprosy instantly disappeared, the wasted forms of men were lifted into the joys of health; that this lowly Nazarene, with a tenderness which seems infinite, delivered those who were bereft of reason from those unnamed and unknown tortures of mind experienced by the insane, and restored them to a peaceful spirit and to the fellowship of friends? Would it be better to preserve inviolate this speculative theory than that four thousand men, besides women and children, who were out in the wild desert's waste, after suffering from three days' hunger, "having nothing to eat," than that Jesus should, with such dignity, benignity, and beneficence, so rend nature and do violence to its laws, by feeding the multitude by multiplying the loaves and fishes! "Woe to those who call evil good, and good evil; that put darkness for

light, and light for darkness." Is not the postulate itself the very extreme of superficiality and absurdity?

It is the discriminating remark of Dr. Philip Schaff that—

"We are told that miracles are impossible. This is an *à priori* assumption and pseudo-philosophical prejudice, in the face of the Apostolic Age, the whole Bible, and the common belief of mankind in all ages. It is an unproved dogma turned against the facts."¹¹

Truly has Dr. Van Oosterzee observed:

"*The right to deny à priori* the possibility of a miracle—if at least one believed in a personal, living God—*has never yet been proved.*"¹²

It is to be noted that science knows nothing of creation, as it invariably begins with organization. What æons intervened between the two, no living man can tell. But to § 156. Creation speak of the Genesis of the world as the product and Science. of chance, is simply preposterous, and forestalls all scientific investigation. Mr. Mozley observes:

"Science is not opposed to the idea of creation, because all that is essential to the integral notion of creation is a beginning; and a beginning is not and can not be disproved. . . . Taking the facts of nature as they stand, and abstracted from any hypothesis respecting them, *the introduction of all the species were generally exertions of a power different from the course of nature.*"¹³

It was the sagacious remark of John Stuart Mill, that "The laws of nature do not account for their own origin."¹⁴ It was the characteristic remark of Thomas Carlyle, in his work on *Frederick the Great*, that "Atheism truly he never could abide. To him, as to all of us, it was flatly inconceivable that intelligent, moral emotion could have been put into him by an entity which had none of its own."¹⁵ Thirty years ago much was said among scientists respecting the origin of life without the office of the living Creator. The doctrine of *spontaneous generation* was stoutly held by Huxley on his discovery of "*Bathybius*," which he defined as "a vast sheet of

¹¹ *Person of Christ*, p. 99.

¹² *Dogmatics*, Vol. II, 565.

¹³ *Transactions of Victoria Institute*, Vol. XX, p. 222.

¹⁴ *Logic*.

¹⁵ *Biography*, B. 23, c. 14.

living matter enveloping the whole earth beneath the seas;"¹⁶ and about the same time Hackel discovered the existence of "*Moneron*," which he understood to be "very minute non-nucleated corpuscles forming the simplest living organisms." These two substances were supposed to bridge the impassable chasm between inorganic and organic matter; between the lifeless and the living nature; so that, starting with the idea of the eternity of matter, the doctrine of creative acts by a living and personal Creator could be absolutely set aside. In 1872, Strauss admitted that, unless the introduction of life could be accounted for on natural grounds, a miracle must have occurred at the beginning of life. He wrote:

"Huxley has discovered the *Bathybius*, a shining heap of jelly on the sea bottom; Hackel, what he calls *Moneres*, structureless clots of albuminous carbon, which, although inorganic in their constitution, yet are all capable of nutrition and accretion. By these the chasm may be said to be bridged, and the transition effected from the inorganic to the organic. *As long as the contrast between the inorganic and organic, lifeless and living nature, was understood to be an absolute one; as long as the conception of a special vital force was retained, there was no possibility of spanning the chasm without the aid of a miracle.*"¹⁷

The greatest microscopist, Professor Lionel Beale, and the greatest physiologist, Dr. W. B. Carpenter, both of London, from the very first rejected Huxley's great discovery of *Bathybius* as an unscientific conclusion. In 1869, Dr. Wallich, of London, in the *Monthly Microscopic Journal*, made an exposure of the unscientific character of Huxley's claim for his *Bathybius* from scientific *data*. Meantime the ship *Challenger* made deep-sea soundings, gathering new evidence against Huxley's doctrine. In 1874, Professor Beale in his work on *Protoplasm*—a work mentioned by the *North American Review* as "one of the most remarkable books of the age"—says in reference to *Bathybius* that—

"Instead of being a widely-extending sheet of living protoplasm which grows at the expense of inorganic elements, it is rather to be regarded as a complex mass of slime with many foreign bodies and the *dbris* of living organisms which have passed away."

¹⁶*Microscopic Journal*, 1868, cited by Joseph Cook, *Biol.* p. 2.

¹⁷*The Old Faith and the New*, §48. See Joseph Cook's *Boston Lects.*, *Biol.* pp. 2, 3.

The German Naturalists' Association at Hamburg, in 1876, repudiated Bathybius; and soon, according to Professor Dana, of Yale University, in the *American Journal of Science and Arts*,¹⁸ Huxley himself surrendered his discovery as being an empty pretense, an unscientific conclusion! Such was the end of the "fact" which was to be the golden bridge which was to relegate the doctrine of a supernatural Creator and supernatural miracles to the myths of oblivion! Tyndall exploded the hypothesis of spontaneous generation.

It is now easy to understand why Humboldt in a letter to a friend once wrote:

"What I do not like in Strauss is the scientific frivolity with which he finds no difficulty in accepting the generation of organic matter from inorganic, or even the formation of man from some primeval slime."¹⁹

The confession of Strauss is now in place:

"As long as the contrast between the organic and inorganic . . . is an absolute one, as long as the conception as a special force [*i. e.* a Creator] was retained, there is no possibility of spanning the chasm without the aid of a miracle."

Since, as Mill observes, "the laws of nature § 157. Origin do not account for their own origin," what is of Life. to be said of *the Origin of Life*? Strauss said in 1872:

"*Miracle must be confessed* to have occurred *once* at least at the *introduction of life*, unless some method of filling up the chasm between the dead and the living forms can be found."²⁰

Not only has the chasm not been filled, but the notion is absolutely abandoned, and the voice of scientists is now universally against the notion as frivolous to affirm that there is possible a spontaneous origin of life.

Häckel conceded that "most naturalists of our time give up the attempt to account for the origin of life by natural causes."²¹ Du Bois Raymond says: "It is futile to attempt by chemistry to bridge over the chasm between the living and the not-living." Huxley said: "If the theory of evolution is true, the living must have arisen from the not-living." "The chasm between the living and the not-living, the present

¹⁸ See Joseph Cook, *Biology*, pp. 2-4.

¹⁹ *Letters to Varnhagen*, 4th ed. p. 117.

²⁰ *Old Faith*, etc., § 48.

²¹ *Hist. of Creation*, Vol. I, 327.

state of knowledge can not bridge.”²² Sir William Thomson declares: “This seems to me to be as sure a teaching of science as the law of gravitation, that life proceeds from life, and nothing but life.”²³ Kant said: “Give me matter and I will explain the formation of the world; give me matter *alone*, and I can not explain the formation of a caterpillar.”²⁴ Tyndall said: “If we look at matter as defined for generations in our scientific text-books, the notion of conscious life coming out of it can not be formed by the mind.” “Life came only from antecedent life. . . . Either let us open our eyes to the conception of creative acts, or, abandoning them, let us radically change our notions of matter.”²⁵ Dr. Liebig wrote: “Some philosophers have affirmed that life has existed from eternity. Natural science has proved that at a certain period the earth in temperature was such that no organic life could exist, and that therefore it must have had a beginning.”²⁶ Müller says: “Only a miraculous interruption of the natural laws can form a living organism out of lifeless matter.” Dr. Schenkel says: “The already existing harmony of nature is as little annihilated by the appearance of an absolute creative act of God in the world, as is humanity itself by the entrance of a new personality.”²⁷ Dr. Carpenter stated: “The convertibility of physical forces, the correlation of these with the vital, and the intimacy of that *nexus* between mental and bodily activity which, explain it as we may, can not be denied, all lead up to one and the same conclusion—the source of all power in mind.”²⁸ Or, as expressed by W. R. Grove: “Causation is the will, creation the act of God.”²⁹ Dr. Christlieb says: “How did the first living organism originate? Modern science has unquestionably demonstrated that life did not always exist on earth and Cuvier long ago confidently maintained this to be the case, and that we could easily indicate the point of time when life began.” “And not only does the entrance of higher forms of life interrupt the chain of natural causes; for within the different grades of existence themselves, we see the laws broken by exceptions in certain points.”³⁰

So, then, there was a beginning of life on earth, and the essential idea of a creation *is a beginning; and all life is dependent on antecedent life*. Scientifically considered, this was a beginning; theologically, it was a creation. Whatever it may be called, it was a supernatural intervention and change wrought on all precedent natural conditions. What, then, is

²² *Encycl. Brit.: Biol.*

²³ Inaugural Address before British Association, *Nature*, Vol. IV, 269.

²⁴ Cited by Joseph Cook, *Biology*, p. 40. ²⁵ *Belfast Address*.

²⁶ *Augsburger Allgemeine Zeitung*, 1856. ²⁷ *Christliche Dogmatik*, 258.

²⁸ *Mental Physiology*, c. xx. ²⁹ *Essay on the Correlation of Physical Forces*.

³⁰ *Mod. Doubt and Christian Belief*, 303-305, note.

the warrant or value of the thought which supposes that, when God created the universe, he narrowed himself down to limitations in freedom, power, and prerogative to that which he had created, so that he can not work miracles? Nitzsch has happily remarked, "*Miracles belong to a higher order of things, which is nature also.*" Creation was a radical and revolutionary innovation as respects all prior conditions of nature. The new and unseen Force which was introduced was as silent and certainly as powerful as that which germinates the seed in the soil, or marks the bursting forth of bud and bloom in springtime, or illustrates itself in the falling of the sunshine which we can see. For at last all nature's activities and laws are but *effects*, referable to the one Divine *First Cause*. But in what intelligible sense was *the beginning* an innovation to be held as "*a rent*" or "*a violence*" on pre-existent nature?

Nitzsch justly observed that "the denial of miracles involves the denial of the free, living, personal God;" or, as expressed by Dr. Christlieb, "He that believes in God as a free, living, personal Will, has settled § 158. Conceptions of God. for himself the possibility of miracles." *Deism* is the conception which *separates* God from the universe which he created, and holds that nature upholds itself and controls its activities by virtue of its own laws, without the intervention and power of God. *Materialism*, on the contrary, *identifies* God with matter as one, in that complete sense that it denies all separate and spiritual existence, negating God as a Spirit. *Pantheism* is that conception of God which holds that he is identical with the world, so that outside and beyond matter he does not exist; that he is the Soul of the universe, and all nature is his body. So far from God being a living, self-conscious personality, he is the merest *It*—a somewhat having power without intelligence. Of course, such conceptions of the Almighty Godhead are incompatible with the possibility of miracles.

MIRACLES CONTRARY TO UNIVERSAL EXPERIENCE.

Mr. David Hume, of England, was the apostle of this proposition. It is said to have been originally perpetrated as a joke to worry a Jesuitical priest, who had just reported to him in conversation a miracle wrought by the Romanists. Afterwards, however, thinking that he had thought better than he meant, he amplified his argument in an *Essay on Miracles*, in which he says:

“For miracles we have the testimony of a few persons; against them we have universal experience; therefore, this stronger testimony nullifies the weaker and more questionable.”

Notwithstanding the sophistry of this position has been often exposed, Strauss thought his “*Essay on Miracles* was so universally convincing that he [Hume] may be said to have settled the question!”

Now, precisely what is meant by “*universal experience?*” It is defined as “*the uniform and undeviating experience of all mankind in all ages of the world.*” The definition is fair. But it may properly be asked, When, and how, and by whom has the *consensus* of “the universal experience of all mankind in all ages of the world” been taken? And who is the responsible custodian of the report made? It is easily shown that the “experience of men” on different parts of the globe is often variant, and sometimes diametrically the opposite. The experience of mankind in the torrid zone would attest the fact that snows are never known to fall, or frosts to blight, or water to congeal into ice; but experience in the Arctic Zone would attest that the earth is universally bound up solid in the embrace of perpetual snows and ice, where is nothing green, and glint exists. If it be claimed, however, that in the universal experience of the whole heathen world in all the ages past, miracles have never been known, the fact may be conceded without a word of con-

§159. Miracles
and
Experience.

tention. But the affirmant has surrendered his own premise of "universal experience." The experience of the heathen world is very far from being "the universal experience of all mankind in all ages of the world." Very obviously, if we are to find miracles at all among men, we must find them where they occur, and not where they are utterly unknown. As a matter of evidence, one might as well demand to see icebergs at the line of the Equator before he will believe that they exist, as to demand Christian miracles in the outside heathen world. *It should be carefully noted that the postulate which excludes the history of miracles wrought in the Jewish nation and during the first four centuries of the Christian era within the Roman Empire, does not, nor can be, admitted to represent "the universal experience of all mankind in all ages of the world."* Upon the other hand, it may be safely affirmed that universal experience does *not* sustain the postulate that miracles never occurred. We know heathen experience only by its history; by the same canon of belief we learn of miracles in the Christian world. To omit the experience of the only valid witnesses in the case, would resemble "the play of *Hamlet* with *Hamlet* left out!" To prove a given crime by witnesses, the fundamental question would be, not who *did not see it, but who did*. The testimony of the whole witnessing Church of God on earth, with its centuries of experience in history, solemnly attests that miracles were wrought within "the universal experience of all mankind in all ages of the world." It is much to the advantage of the argument, *that miracles were never once denied in those centuries where and when they occurred, and by those who were most entitled to know*. Upon the contrary, as we have seen, miraculous occurrences are distinctly admitted, the kind of miracle wrought was designated, and the names of those who wrought them were given, by those who were enemies of the religion which produced them.

MIRACLES HAVE NEVER BEEN INVESTIGATED.

Nothing has been more put forward as a stock expression by a certain class of *disbelievers* than that miracles were never subjected to investigation. Is this true, indeed? *Then miracles have been rejected without investigation!* "He that judgeth before he heareth is not wise." Both Strauss of Germany and Rénan of France issued this broad challenge.

Dr. David Strauss wrote:

§160. Strauss "If the friends of the miraculous would explain to
 on us the working laws [of miracles] as clearly as we know
 Investigation. the laws which govern the action of steam, we should
 then consider their arguments as something more than mere talk."³¹

Confessedly, the spirit of this gibe, intended for those who differ with Strauss, does not happily illustrate a philosophical mind in search of truth. He should have known that if the higher law of the supernatural *could be explained*, that fact would take the case out of the category of the supernatural at once; it would not be a miracle. Truly did the skeptical Schilling say: "Nothing is more doleful than the occupation of all rationalists who strive to make that rational which declares itself above all reason." We do not explain "the working laws" of our own natures, how thought co-ordinates with the sensibilities and with the human will, resulting in the external action; nor do we have to understand all this inter-relation and inter-action in order to believe any given fact. We do not believe *how* the grass grows; but we believe *that* it grows, nevertheless. Who has ever explained the internal "working laws" whereby the acorn is converted into the oak? Nature is full of mysteries which were never understood, but which we all accept and believe. Test microscopically and chemically, as you will, two eggs of different species, which, however, so far as discernible, are exactly alike in appearance, in weight, size, color, substance, in quality, and quantity. The

³¹ Cited in *Modern Doubt*, etc., 323.

one egg invariably hatches the bird, the other the serpent. Now, in return, an explanation of nature is in demand. Is the fact to be deemed incredible because it is inexplicable? Can we explain, not the external conditions, but the internal origin of life in the egg? No man has ever yet explained the "working laws" involved; nevertheless every man believes the fact when it occurs, unless he is an idiot. Until one can explain the phenomena of nature, or of life, or of history, he debars himself from all right on this ground to object *à priori* to the possibility of miracles. Rightfully does Christlieb say:

"We now demand of those who reject the miraculous that they shall explain to us, from natural causes, all the phenomena in nature and history. If they can not do it, they have no right to contest the possibility and the historical nature of the miraculous. . . . Unbelief has yet to find a satisfactory explanation for the most important facts in history. The more thoroughly it investigates, the less can it conceal this. . . . And what is, then, the last resort for deniers of the miraculous? When the connecting links in nature no longer suffice, they are feign to *recur to chance*. . . . But to take refuge in chance is the death of all scientific investigation."³²

In one of Joseph Ernest Rénan's later works, entitled *The Apostles*, he says:

"It is an absolute rule of criticism to deny a place in history to narratives of miraculous circumstances. . . . Such facts have never been really proved. All the pretended miracles near §161. Renan on Investigation. enough to examine are referable to illusion or imposture. If a single [modern] miracle had ever been proved, we could not reject in a mass all those of ancient history; for admitting that very many of these last [modern miracles] were false, we might still believe that some of them were true. But not so. Discussion and examination are fatal to miracles. Are we not, then, authorized to believe that those miracles which date centuries back, and regarding which there are no means of forming a contradictory debate, are also without reality?"³³

a) Two things very remarkable occur in this paragraph. One is that M. Rénan, as a critic, should reject that which is true because of the false; should disallow the money of the genuine bank because of its counterfeit; should disown the

³² Christlieb, *Modern Doubt*, 329, 330. ³³ *Introduction*, p. 37, Amer. ed. 1879.

ancient miracles of history because of modern pretenses confessedly false. This evidences a strange lack of discrimination in judgment. Another characteristic is, that he accentuates that "discussion and examination are fatal to miracles," but respecting "those miracles which date centuries back . . . there are no means for forming a contradictory debate." If ancient miracles can not be opposed by reason in debate, why reject them *without* reason?

Just what kind of evidence M. Rénan demands when he says, "Such facts have never been proved," it would be interesting to know. If he means historical proof of such occurrences has not been adduced, he is certainly much at fault as a Professor of History. There are concessions and clear affirmations, and no contradictions made by Jews and heathen directly to the contrary, as we have seen. These attestations of the fact of miracles come from those who were even more hostile to Christianity than was M. Rénan. But they had this advantage of this writer; they were the contemporaries of the miraculous events, and knew what they were writing about far better than one living in the nineteenth or twentieth century. We have the testimony of the Jewish Talmud, the *Toledoth Jeshu*, the *Antiquities* of Josephus on the one hand, and on the part of the heathen, the testimony of Celsus, of Hierocles, and of Julian the Emperor, confirmed by the testimony of a document written by an Arab, reconfirmed by the witness of Tertullian, Quadratus, Origen, and a host of Christian writers of that period. These speak of facts which occurred where and when they were living, or near that time; and M. Rénan gives us *his mere opinion*, without justifying reasons, to overthrow the testimony of these witnesses! No amount of denial on the part of a disbeliever who knows nothing of the facts in dispute can cancel the historical statements of those who were contemporaries of the miraculous occurrences. It is sheer dogmatism thus to deny. It certainly requires more than M. Rénan's *dictum* to establish it "as an

absolute rule of criticism to deny a place in history to narratives of miraculous circumstances." He is severely criticised by scholarly writers for his facile methods of substituting the vagaries of his own imagination for facts touching the transactions recorded in the historical New Testament.*

β) M. Rénan further remarks:

"Miracles only exist when people believe in them. . . . A miracle at Paris, for instance, before experienced *savants* would put an end to all doubt!† A miracle never takes place before an incredulous and skeptical public, the most in need of such convincing proof. Credulity on the part of the witness is the essential condition of a miracle. There is not a solitary exception to the rule that miracles are never produced before those who are able or permitted to discuss and criticise them."³⁴

Rénan has welded together as one the silly pretense of the modern and the historical miracles of the apostles. He refuses to separate them as of altogether different character. His remark, therefore, is a gratuitous sneer unbecoming the courteous Frenchman, and a cheap contempt for Christianity to come from a gentle philosopher. It indicates a vice of mind which disqualifies the writer for taking a fair view of things which come within the domain of sacred history. It is his misfortune that in matters relating to the Christian religion he is interested less in the facts to be sought than in their denial. To say that miracles exist only when

*Dr. Tischendorf says of Rénan's writings: "This theory of the rise of the Gospels has culminated in a piece of botchwork, . . . issued from the Paris press in 1863. The author, . . . not troubling himself . . . respecting the share which the apostles may have had in delineating the Gospel portraits, but following his own self-imposed theories about miracles and revelation, has displayed boundless recklessness, and given way to the most unbridled phantasies respecting the Gospel history, caricaturing both it and its Hero. He has written a book which has much more the character of a shameless calumny of Jesus than of an honest investigation into his career." (*Origin of The Four Gospels*, pp. 27, 28, Amer. Tract Society.)

†Christlieb says to this: "Perhaps before the French Academy? We would remind those who feel inclined to submit to its decision as infallible that this body in former times rejected (1) the use of quinine, (2) of vaccination, (3) lightning conductors, (4) the existence of meteorites, (5) the steam engine." (*Mod. Doubt*, p. 324, n.)

³⁴ *The Apostles*, p. 37.

people believe in them, is even better than to disbelieve in them when they actually occur.

The statement of this Professor of History in the University of France is historically inexact according to the only authentic documents we have on that subject. The history of miracles in both the Old and New Testament is an open and standing contradiction of his whole position. Test the fact from the very first instance unto the last. When Moses and Aaron stood before Pharaoh,⁸⁵ that ruler called in his "magicians with their enchantments" to confront and contest the validity of the miraculous signs evidencing a message from God. The contestants broke down completely in the contention, and acknowledged that the wonders wrought by Moses were wrought "by the finger of God!" The narration must stand as authentic until the claim is refuted. Does it prove that "credulity on the part of the witness was the essential condition of a miracle?" When Elijah on Mount Carmel⁸⁶ met the eight hundred and fifty priests and patrons of the god Baal, to test and contest whether Baal or Jehovah was the true God, in the presence of the miraculous sign in sacrifice, when fire fell from heaven at the prayer of the prophet, the unwilling people who saw it fell upon their faces and cried aloud, "The Lord he is God; the Lord he is God." What, then, becomes of Rénan's famous assumption that "Credulity on the part of the witness is the essential condition of a miracle;" and "miracle never takes place before an incredulous and skeptical public, the most in need of convincing proof?"

Turn to the history of miracles in the New Testament. The first miracle wrought by the apostles* was that wrought upon the person of the lame-born at the Gate Beautiful, at the temple grounds at Jerusalem. The man was instantly cured by the word of Peter, in the presence of adversaries. But what was of more importance was the fact that, when Peter

*That is, after those of Pentecost, Acts ii, 43.

⁸⁵ Exodus viii, 19, etc. ⁸⁶ 1 Kings xviii.

and John had been arrested and arraigned before the Sanhedrin, which sought to suppress the apostles and their work, they were constrained to confess: "What shall we do with these men? for that a notable miracle hath been done by them is manifest to all that dwell at Jerusalem, *and we can not deny it.*"³⁷ What, then, is to be thought of the reckless statement that "There is not a solitary exception to the rule that miracles are never produced before those who are able and permitted to discuss and criticise them!" The same conditions were present in the course of Christ's own ministry. When Jesus cured "the sick of the palsy," the opposing scribes did not deny the miracle, but said, "This man blasphemeth;" but "the multitudes saw it, . . . and glorified God who had given such power to men."³⁸ When he proposed to raise the dead daughter of Jairus, the ruler of the synagogue, those that stood by "laughed him to scorn," but when it became an accomplished fact they were silenced and amazed at what had been wrought.³⁹ Even the Pharisees did not attempt to deny his miracles, but admitting the fact, ascribed the power to the devil!⁴⁰

In the light of history there is no justification to be offered for Rénan's frivolous and unhistorical remark that "a miracle never takes place before an incredulous and skeptical public." Whatever is done in historical investigation, we can not and must not attempt to change the facts of history. We can not play fast-and-loose with the Christian facts which are to be investigated. As to the sacred narratives, we must either accept the accounts as they stand, or refute them with judgment in open, fair, and scholarly criticism. On this point Dr. Christlieb says:

"Rénan proceeds to contest the actuality of all Scriptural miracles, maintaining that no miracle has been established as such, and that 'all supposed miraculous facts which we have been in a position to examine, have proved to be delusions and deceptions.' This result, of course, is

³⁷ Acts iv, 16. ³⁸ Matt. ix, 1-8; Mark ii, 3-12. ³⁹ Mark v, 40-42; Luke viii, 41, 42, 53-56.

⁴⁰ Matt. xii, 24; Mark iii, 22, 23; Luke xi, 15.

obtained in the most facile manner, by simply changing the facts which are too stubborn to evaporate into delusions, into myths and legends." "The man who calmly affirms that no miracle has appeared before those who are capable of criticising it, and who thus declares that the entire Jewish and Roman world, with all their learned and wise men, among whom Christ and his apostles did so many [miraculous] signs, to have been utterly incapable of forming a true judgment in regard to them,—such a man simply gives vent to the presumption of the nineteenth century, which, on so many questions, arrogates to itself the monopoly of 'competent criticism.'"⁴¹

γ) It may now be assumed that the distinction between the Natural and the Supernatural is drawn with sufficient clearness, and that the laws of nature for their existence and maintenance refer us to the Divine Mind as the one and supreme Author. The following inferences are therefore legitimated:

1. The Absolutism of Nature is a claim which is not, and never was justified by proofs.
2. It is unscientific to hold that natural laws are coercive, or exclusive of miracles.
3. The lower forces of nature are never suspended or annihilated by the higher forces.
4. Miracles do not suspend or supersede the natural forces, but simply supplement them.
5. If man has power to modify *the effects* of natural laws, much more has the Infinite God.
6. The work of Creation and the Origin of life on earth were supernatural occurrences.
7. Universal experience in all ages includes, but never excludes, the fact of miracles.
8. The history of miracles develops the truth that they were always open to investigation.

⁴¹ *Modern Doubt, etc.*, 325.

CHAPTER IX.

PASSION, DEATH, AND BURIAL OF JESUS CHRIST.

I. INCIDENTS OF HIS PASSION :

Testimony of Celsus, Porphyry, Toledoth Jeshu, and the Jewish Talmud.

II. INCIDENTS OF HIS DEATH :

Celsus, Talmud, Toledoth Jeshu, Josephus, Lucian, Hierocles, Tacitus, Mara, and Dr. Heinrich Graetz.

III. INCIDENTS OF HIS BURIAL :

Celsus, Tacitus, Rabbi Frey, R. Abrabanel.

IV. CONFIRMATION OF ADVERSARIES' TESTIMONY BY CHRISTIAN WRITERS :

- a) *Testimony of a Christian Apostle: Paul.*
- β) *Testimony of Apostolic Fathers: Barnabas and Ignatius.*
- γ) *Testimony of Christian Apologists: Aristides, Tertullian and Jerome.*

V. INDUCTIONS FROM THE FACTS AND EVIDENCE ADDUCED.

CHAPTER IX.

PASSION, DEATH, AND BURIAL OF JESUS CHRIST.

§ 162. Sources: Biographical Epitomes, and Literature.

(ADVERSARIES.)

1. LUCIAN (A. D. 120-200) was born in Samosata, Syria, and flourished in the reign of the Emperor Hadrian (117-138). Under the guise of a narrative he assailed the Christians and the Christian religion with wit and ridicule in a letter written to one Chronis, in which he indulged in both fiction and a parody representative of the death of one Proteus or Peregrinus as being a Christian. He has been critically characterized as "a brilliant but frivolous rhetorician," "an Epicurean, worldling, and infidel, . . . who could see in Christianity only one of the many vagaries and follies of mankind; in miracles, only jugglery; in the belief of immortality, an empty dream; and in their contempt of death, and brotherly love of Christians, to which he was constrained to testify, [only] a silly enthusiasm." (Schaff.)
2. HENRY ST. JOHN, LORD BOLINGBROKE (1678-1751), was an English statesman and author, who made himself quite notorious by his hostility to Christianity in the first half of the eighteenth century. He was content to resolve "all morality into self-love as the first principle and final center" of human interest. That is, he put himself in the place of God! "He was educated at Eton and Oxford, and was extremely dissipated in youth." "He was brilliant and versatile, but not profound." "His collection of works have but little merit except style." (Johnson's *Cyclop.*)
3. EDWARD GIBBON (1737-1794), who attained great fame as an historian. In youth he studied at Westminster and Oxford; became a Roman Catholic; renounced his Catholicism and religion in 1754, and became and continued a confirmed skeptic. He made great acquisitions in both classic and French literature. One day, while musing in Rome, and the barefooted friars were engaged in their vesper devotions, the thought first occurred to him to write his history of the *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*. He proceeded at once to begin the work, which he executed during 1776-1788, when it was published. The best editions are those edited

either by William Smith, or that by Milman. Able as the work certainly is in so many respects, in critical opinion he is regarded as exceedingly *unfair* toward the early Christians, magnifying their frailties into faults, and being seemingly incapable of appreciating their virtues or their proper claims of conscience. He was utterly pitiless of the martyrs for the truth, and had no sense of their rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

(FRIENDS.)

4. THE APOSTOLIC FATHERS were so named because they were the immediate pupils of the apostles, and, at the same time, the first Fathers of the Christian Church. They were, therefore, both contemporaries and successors of the apostles, and the connecting link between the Apostolical and the Primitive Church. They did not claim *theopneustia* (inspiration) in their work as did the apostles, nor was it ascribed to them by the Church. Their simple function was to reproduce and hand down the apostles' teachings as they had been taught by them. Sometimes the writings of the Apostolic Fathers were read in the Churchly assemblies, but their writings were not considered as a part of the Canonical Scriptures, but as friendly and Christian counsel to enforce the apostles' teachings. The evidential value of their writings in Christian history is great, for the reasons that they were for years the personal associates of the apostles, and, after them, were the first recipients of apostolic teaching and the media through whom those teachings were transmitted to us; that they were at once the custodians and witnesses of the apostolic Scriptures and doctrines, which they had received in both an oral and a written form. They treat the writings of the apostles with profoundest reverence as being the exclusive authority for the Christian Church. They based their own teachings upon the apostolic doctrines.
5. BARNABAS (70-79) was not the companion of Paul (Acts xiii, 1, 2), but one of the earliest writers of the *Apostolic Fathers*. He is only known in his Epistle, which is a curious document, but of very evidential character. "There is no reason to believe that he received his appointment to the apostolate directly from the Lord." (Westcott, *Canon of N. T.* 42.) "Our opinion is that these arguments are fatal to the authorship of [the Apostle] Barnabas or any other apostle. It is quite possible that some Alexandrian Christian by the name of Barnabas may have written [this Epistle], for the work is evidently of Alexandrian origin; its cast of thought and mode of exegesis being such as could hardly have arisen elsewhere." (Cruttwell's *Literary History of Early Christianity*, I, 48, 49; 1893.) The Epistle was written in Greek and was found attached to the celebrated Sinaitic Manuscript of the New Testa-

ment discovered by the celebrated Dr. Tischendorf in the St. Catherine Convent in 1859, "beginning with the fourth page where Revelation ends." (Salmon.) It contains twenty-one brief chapters. It witnesses to the existence of a *written Gospel* in A. D. 70-79.

The date of this Epistle is not absolutely certain; but critical opinions assign the document to the sub-apostolic age, in the seventh decade; but some so late as A. D. 138.

a) *Those placing the date of Barnabas's Epistle in the second century are:*

Westcott: "Not before the beginning of the second century." (*Canon*, 42.)

Fisher: "Very early in the second century." (*Beginnings of Christianity*, 278.)

Kaysers, Baur, Müller, and Lipsius: A. D. 107-120; *Hefele*, 137. (*Schaff, Ch. Hist.* II, 679, n. 2.)

Tischendorf: "About 117." (*Origin of the Four Gospels*, 155, 163.)

Valkmar: "Under Hadrian;" *i. e.*, A. D. 119-138.

Crooks: "About 125-150." (Letter.)

β) *Those ascribing the Epistle to the first century are:*

Hilgenfeld, Reuss, Ewald, Weizsächer, Weiseler, and Funk: "At the close of the first century, or before 79."

Milligan: "Soon after the destruction of Jerusalem" [70]. (*Schaff, Ch. Hist.* II, 678.)

Cruttwell: "70-132" A. D. (*Lit. Hist. of Early Christianity*, 48, 49.)

Hilgenfeld: "Under [the emperor] Nerva, 96-98." (*Cruttwell*, I, 49.)

Smith and Wace: "Only a few years after the destruction of Jerusalem;" *i. e.*, A. D. 70. (*Dict. Christ. Biog.*)

Bunsen: "About fifteen years before the Gospel of John." (*Hippolytus and his Age*, I, 54.)

Ewald, Weizsächer, Cunningham: "Not many years later than Vespasian," 70-79. (*West. Can.* 42 n. 1.)

Holzmann: "The Epistle to Hebrews and the Epistle of Barnabas, written about the same time." (Cited by *Watkins, Bampt. Lects.*, 1890.)

Bishop Lightfoot: "We should probably place the date . . . between 70-79." (*Apos. Faths.* 241, ed. 1891.)

Professor Salmon: "We must ascribe it to the reign of Vespasian, A. D. 70-79." (*Introd.* 513, 518.)

Harman: "It must have come down from the first century." (*Introd. of Scripts.* 515, and n.)

The date here given for the Epistle of Barnabas is the seventh decade of the first century, which would be about forty years after the ascension of Christ, and about fifteen years after the publication of the Gospels. The special value of this document is the

citation it makes of Matt. xx, 16; xxii, 14, in the exact words of the Evangelist, under the formula "*It is written*," which is the earliest testimony of the written Gospel known.

6. MARCIANUS ARISTIDES (wrote 123-139) was a philosopher of Athens, who is mentioned by Eusebius (*Eccl. Hist.* IV, c. 3) as the contemporary of Quadratus. He describes Aristides as "a faithful man of our religion, who left an *Apology* of our faith, as Quadratus did, addressed to Hadrian." Jerome corroborates Eusebius, and relates that after Aristides became a Christian, he still continued to wear the philosopher's garb, and that he presented to Hadrian "a book containing an account of our sect, that is an *Apology* [or *Defense*] for the Christians, which is still extant; a monument with the learned of his ingenuity." (*De Illustribus Viris*, I, 20.)

This *Defense* of Aristides was lost for centuries, but was recently recovered in its complete form. An Armenian translation, discovered in 1878, was the first document brought to light. Rénan, with his characteristic repugnance to Christianity, denounced the document as spurious. In 1889, Rendal Harris, of Philadelphia, while traveling in Syria, discovered at St. Catherine at Sinai a Syrian manuscript containing a translation of the long-lost *Apology* of Aristides. Its accordancy with the Armenian translation is such as completely substantiates the identity and authenticity of this *Apology*. But there is this curious discrepancy: the Syrian manuscript makes it clear that the document was originally addressed to Antoninus Pius (139-161), instead of Hadrian (117-138) according to the Armenian document and the statement of Eusebius, and also Jerome. The Syriac gives the writer's full name as Marcianus Aristides. "Now, this name is otherwise known as that of a Christian of great authority in Smyrna, living about A. D. 138-140." (Cruttwell, *Literary Hist.* I, 292.) A point of principal interest contained in this *Apology* is the early formulation of the "Apostles' Creed," though not in its complete form.

7. LACTANTIUS (250-330) was a rhetorician and orator of great distinction. The Emperor Diocletian invited him to settle in Nicomedia as Professor of Eloquence. This was about A. D. 301. About 312, Constantine brought him to court in Gaul, and appointed him the teacher of his own son Crispus. Lactantius commanded a cultivated style, and possessed withal remarkable power of expression. Jerome characterizes him as "the most learned man of his time." He witnessed the cruel persecutions of the Christians for their faith, but without sharing their sufferings, and was well prepared to write in defense of his reviled religion. Lactantius was called "the Christian Cicero." His principal work was his *Divine Institutes*, which was at once a refutation of paganism, and a Christian *Apology*—a work which he dedicated to his friend and patron Con-

stantine the Great as the first Christian emperor. In his work entitled *De Morte*, or *Mortibus Persecutorum*, if he is the author, he denounced Nero's cruelties to Diocletian, Galarius, and Maximinus, invoking God's judgments upon the persecutors.

8. JEROME (*Sopronius Eusebius Hieronymus*) was born at Stridon, on the confines of Dalmatia, between 331 and 342. He is recognized as the connecting link between the Eastern and the Western Churches. The child of Christian parents, he was carefully educated under Donatus, the famous heathen grammarian, and Victorinus, a distinguished rhetorician. He traveled extensively abroad. But he devoted himself most devoutly to the studies and labors of an ascetic monk. He attached to his cause many converts in a remarkable manner, especially Roman ladies of the patrician families, to whom he expounded the Scriptures, and induced many to become nuns. In 386, Jerome, with Paula and her daughter Eustochium, settled in Bethlehem in Judæa. Paula, being a patrician of wealth and distinction, built three convents for nuns, and one for the monks, over which Jerome presided. Here Jerome translated the Bible into the Latin, now known as *The Vulgate* edition. Jerome died at a great age of fever, about the year 419 or 420.

PASSION, DEATH, AND BURIAL OF JESUS CHRIST.

The death of Christ is so distinctly foretold in the fifty-third chapter of Isaiah that I am forced to believe that Jesus, by a series of preconcerted measures, brought on his own crucifixion in order that his followers might appeal for supernatural proof to the ancient prophecy.—BOLINGBROKE.

If the life and death of Socrates were those of a sage, the life and death of Jesus were those of a God.—ROUSSEAU.

It was something far deadlier than death.—FARRAR.

For Christ suffered for sin once, the Righteous for the unrighteous, that he might bring us to God.—PETER.

And when [Pilate] knew it from the centurion, he gave the dead body to Joseph.—MARK.

Now, in the place where he was crucified there was a garden, and in the garden a new sepulcher wherein was man never yet laid. There laid they Jesus, . . . for the sepulcher was nigh at hand.—JOHN.

Παρέδωκα γὰρ ὑμῖν ἐν πρώτοις ὃ καὶ παρέλαβον, ὅτι Χριστὸς ἀπέθανεν ὑπὲρ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν κατὰ τὰς γραφάς καὶ ὅτι ἐτάφη.—“For I delivered unto you, first of all, that which I also received, how that Christ died for our sins, according to the Scriptures; and that he was buried.”—PAUL.

ARGUMENT.

The argument now proposed is to prove, not merely that the facts known as the passion, the death, and burial of Jesus Christ actually occurred, together with certain incidental circumstances accompanying, but especially that the record of these particulars in the historical New Testament is a truthful and authentic account of those facts. They were all recognized and acknowledged by those who were pre-eminently hostile to the faith. One especial object is to substantiate by adversaries that *the death of Jesus was real*, and that despite the malice of men—at the instigation of the Jews and by the execution by the Romans—Jesus died in the interests of mankind. It was the gracious design of God to save men through his death, without reference to the mode or manner of it. Hence the doctrine of an Atonement for sin, and the Redemption offered to mankind through the suffering Savior, were cardinal in the Christian religion from its origin, and furnish no possible room for any supposable accretions of myths or illustration of legends. Moreover, these doctrines were propagated by the apostles, and so entered into the very structure and purpose developed in the Scriptures of the New Testament, substantiating, on the Christian side, the antiquity, authenticity, and Divinity of those Scriptures.

1. Incidents of Christ's Passion.
2. Incidents of Christ's Death.
3. Incidents of Christ's Burial.

The celebrated descriptive portraiture by Plato of his ideal § 163. Plato's "Just and Righteous Man" has a striking applicability to Jesus Christ in his humiliation and final sufferings. He says:

"A man of true simplicity and nobleness, resolved, as Æsculapius says, not to *seem*, but to *be good*. We must certainly take away the *seeming*; for if he be thought to be a just man he will have honors and gifts on the strength of his reputation, so that it will be uncertain whether it is for justice's sake, or for the gifts and honors, that he is what he is. Yes, we must strip him bare of everything but justice, and make his whole case the reverse of the former [*i. e.*, the unjust man already described]. Without being guilty of one unjust act, let him have the worst reputation for injustice, so that his virtue may be thoroughly tested and be shown to be proof against infamy and all its consequences, and let him go on to the day of his death steadfast in his justice, but with a lifelong reputation for injustice. After describing the men [the just and the unjust] as we have done, there will be no further difficulty in proceeding, I imagine, to sketch the kind of life which awaits them respectively. They will say that in such a situation the just man will be scourged, racked, fettered, will have his eyes burned out, and at last, after suffering every kind of torture, he will be crucified."¹

¹ Plato's *Republic*, Book II, cited by Davies and Vaughan; also Mair's *Christian Evidence*, p. 371.

Rousseau, one of the most prominent skeptics of the eighteenth century, says of this sketch:

“When Plato paints this imaginary Righteous Man covered with all the opprobrium of crime, and worthy of all the rewards of virtue, *he paints feature for feature Jesus Christ*. The resemblance is so striking that all the Fathers felt it, and it is impossible to mistake it.”

Some facts of especial character now challenge attention respecting the close of our Lord's earthly life. They require careful consideration as being cardinal points in the system of Christianity. Fortunately the testimonies of the early adversaries are available, pointed, and valuable in determining the time and place of the occurrence and incidental circumstances relating to the passion, death, and burial of Jesus. Celsus is remarkably full and frequent in his references to details as we find them recorded in the Gospels, although, with a strange perversity of mind even in a heathen philosopher, he seeks to interpret facts to the disadvantage of Jesus. Worse than all, his frequent sneer is hardly becoming one who professes to be a philosopher wishing to investigate Christianity. He often evidences a bitter spirit toward Jesus and the Christians, designating Christ as an “impostor,”² while Lucian calls him a “Sophist,”³ a term which he often uses in a good sense; and Porphyry mentions “Jesus Christ as a man illustrious for his piety, and who was more powerful than Æsculapius and all the other [Greek] gods.”⁴

§ 164. Facts in Hand.

INCIDENTS OF HIS PASSION.

a) Referring to the Savior's retirement to Gethsemane for prayer, Celsus says:

“Why does he mourn and lament and pray to escape the fear of death, expressing himself in terms like these: ‘O Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me?’”⁵

§ 165. Treachery of the Disciples.

“How should we deem him to be a God . . . who was found attempting to conceal himself, and endeavoring to escape in a most disgraceful manner, and who was betrayed by those whom he called his disciples?”⁶

² *Cels.* 1, 68, close; ii, 55.

⁴ *Colonia*, § 7, cited in *Lard.* vii, 445.

⁵ *Cels.* ii 24, comp. *Matt.* xxvi, 39.

³ *Schaff, Ch. Hist.* II, 95.

⁶ *Ib.* ii, 9.

“No good general or leader of great multitudes was ever betrayed;” but “Jesus, having been betrayed by his subordinates,” did not govern well, but “deceiving his disciples, produced in the minds of the victims of his deceit,” not even the good will which “would be manifested towards a brigand chief.”⁷ Celsus professes to believe that any one “who was a partaker of a man’s table would not conspire against him, much less would he plot against a God, after banqueting with him;”⁸ and he further asks: “How is it [possible] that if Jesus pointed out beforehand both the traitor [Judas] and the perjurer [Peter], they did not fear him as a God, and cease the one from his intended treason, and the other from his perjury?”⁹ The *Toledoth Jeshu* also says that “Jesus was betrayed by Judas.”

β) Celsus refers very distinctly to several incidental circumstances which occurred in connection with the crucifixion. He

§ 166. Christ’s adds:

Sufferings. “To those who mocked Jesus, and put on him the purple robe and the crown of thorns, and placed the reed in his hand.”¹⁰ When the Christians “declare the Logos to be the Son of God,” they “do not present to view a pure and holy Logos, but a most degraded man, who was punished by scourging and crucifixion.”¹¹ The *Toledoth* also mentions that “he was crowned with thorns.” The Jewish Talmud asserts that, “After they had put on his head a crown of thorns, and the Jews and also the soldiers had mocked him, and afterward he was condemned to die,”¹² etc.

γ) As regards Celsus, Origen in his reply says:

“In the next place, throwing a slur upon the exhortations spoken and written to those who have led wicked lives and who invite them to repentance and reformation of heart,” Celsus “asserts that we say that ‘It was to sinners that God has been sent.’”¹³ “He who was a God could neither flee nor be led away a prisoner, and least of all could he be deserted and be delivered up by those who had been his associates, and had shared all things in common, and had had him for their Teacher who was deemed to be the Savior, and the Son of the greatest God.”¹⁴ “O sincere believers! you find fault with us [heathen] because we do not recognize this individual as God, nor agree with you that he endured these [sufferings] for the benefit of mankind.”¹⁵ “Again, if God, like Jupiter in the comedy, should, on awakening from a prolonged slumber, desire to rescue the human race from evil, why did he send this Spirit, of which you speak, into one corner [of the earth]? He ought to have breathed it alike into many bodies, and have them sent out into all the world. . . . But do you not think that you have made the Son of God more ridiculous in sending him to the Jews?”¹⁶

⁷ *Cels.* ii, 12.

⁸ *Ib.* ii, 21.

⁹ *Ib.* ii, 18.

¹⁰ *Ib.* ii, 84.

¹¹ *Ib.* ii, 81.

¹² *Semachoti*, ii, 9.

¹³ *Cels.* iii, 62.

¹⁴ *Ib.* ii, 9.

¹⁵ *Ib.* ii, 88.

¹⁶ *Ib.* vi, 78.

The *Toledoth Jeshu* also affirms that Jesus taught that "his blood should atone for the sins of mankind, and that he appropriated to himself the fifty-third chapter of Isaiah." (For details of Crucifixion, see *Excursus G*, vii.)

Celsus again obviously misrepresents and holds up to ridicule certain Christians as "inspired persons" who claimed to have Christ formed within them the hope of glory, when he says it was "for the purpose of attracting attention and exciting surprise" before the public, but really with the latent sneer in reference to Christ's return to earth to judge the world. He says:

"These are accustomed to say, . . . I am God; I am the Son of God, or I am the Divine Spirit. I am come because the world is perishing; and you, O men, are perishing for your iniquities! But I wish to save you; and you shall see me returning again with heavenly power. Blessed is he who now does me homage. On all the rest I will send down eternal fire, both on cities and on countries. . . . But they give occasion to every fool or impostor to apply them to suit his own purpose."¹⁷

§ 167. Recapitulation.

The earliest adversaries of Christianity here witness to the existence of the disciples of Jesus; to the fact that he did retire to the garden of Gethsemane; to his prayer of agony; to his betrayal by Judas; to his having been deserted by friends; that he was led away by his captors as a prisoner; that he was denied by Peter; that he was scourged by Pilate; that he was mocked by Jews and soldiers; that he was robed in a purple garment; that he was crowned with thorns; that a reed was placed in his hand; and that he was mocked and then condemned to die. These circumstances, related to Christ's passion, are here attested substantially as recorded in the New Testament. Moreover, an enemy of Christ witnesses that he was "a man illustrious for his piety," and more powerful in the impression which he made upon the world and for the influence which he exerts upon mankind than all the heathen gods together; that he was the Teacher

¹⁷ *Cels.* vii, 9.

of the people; that, notwithstanding the infamies intended to be cast upon his name both by the mode and associations of his death, he was "deemed to be the Savior, and Son of the greatest God;" that the sufferings and death of Jesus were believed to be in the interests of mankind; that he was regarded as the Son of God sent to the Jews, and who, in the cruelties endured, made an atonement for the race. *Here are about twenty particular facts and incidents attested just as they are found in these Christian Scriptures. They are taken from the writings of Celsus, the Toledoth Jeshu, the Jewish Talmud, and from the witness of Porphyry—the earliest and worst enemies Christianity ever had to encounter.*

INCIDENTS OF HIS DEATH.

It should be particularly observed that, when the Roman soldier offered Jesus the "vinegar and gall" on the cross to § 168. Christ's
Last Moments. deaden his mortal pains, the potion was instantly rejected,¹⁸ but afterward, when the "vinegar" alone was proffered him to allay the intense thirst induced by his passion, it was promptly received.¹⁹ The sufferings imposed in crucifixion were endured without mitigation. The Messianic prediction was thus fulfilled: "They gave me gall for my meat, and in my thirst they gave me vinegar to drink."²⁰ To these two distinct potions the rabbinical works respectively refer, confirming the sacred narrative.

The Talmud affirms that "after he [Jesus] was condemned to die, they gave him the cup of wormwood, that he should not feel the pangs of death. This mercy to drink wormwood is written in *Abel Rabbati* or *Semachoti*.²¹ The *Toledoth Jeshu* says, "They gave him vinegar to drink." Celsus, probably from ignorance of this Jewish custom, mistakes when he confounds these two potions as one, and misrepresents the fact that Jesus accepted the vinegar, but rejected the other. More

¹⁸ Matt. xxvii, 34; Mark xv, 23.

¹⁹ Matt. xxvii, 43; Mark xv, 36; Luke xxiii, 36; John xix, 29, 30.

²⁰ Psalm lxix, 21.

²¹ *Semachoti*, c. ii, 9.

probably, he was not willing to make the just discrimination. Origen, in citing Celsus, indicates how he colored the facts saying that he "makes the vinegar and gall a subject of reproach," adding:

"He rushed with open mouth to drink of them, and could not endure his thirst as any ordinary man frequently endures it."²² "For what better was it for God to eat the flesh of sheep or to drink vinegar and gall than to feed on filth?"²³ "The Christians, making certain additional statements to those of the Jews, assert that the Son of God has been already sent on account of the sins of the Jews, and that the Jews, having chastised Jesus and given him gall to drink, have brought upon themselves the Divine wrath."²⁴

Paulus of Heidelberg, and other skeptics of that school, have been pleased to believe the unproved conjecture that Jesus did not really die on the cross, but *swooned away*. If there was no death, there was, of course, no resurrection. Special attention, therefore, is directed to this point in the account as given in the sacred narrative, and is so decisively confirmed by adversaries, who also note certain extraordinary circumstances which immediately followed that event. The testimony adduced takes cognizance of circumstances leading up to the crucifixion; that it was effected at the instigation of the Jews; that the mode of his death was inflicted by the Romans; that he was executed by Pontius Pilate, who was procurator of Judæa; that he was put to death at Jerusalem in Palestine; that the time of its occurrence was in the reign of Tiberius Cæsar; that the occurrence happened on the occasion of the Jewish Passover, and the exact hour was at three o'clock in the afternoon, when the evening sacrifice was slain. No historical event of the remote past can be authenticated by better evidence than that given by enemies, who identify the parties involved, the time, the place, the occasion of a given occurrence, and the rulers of the hour. All these facts concur in the death of Christ.

§ 169. His
Death Actually
Occurred.

²² *Cels.* ii, 37.

²³ *Ib.* vii, 13.

²⁴ *Ib.* iv, 22; comp. John xix, 28-30.

a) *His Crucifixion.* Josephus says :

“ When Pilate, at the suggestion of the principal men among us, had condemned him to the cross, those that loved him at the first did not forsake him.”²⁵ Lucian testifies that Jesus was “ a crucified Sophist;” and adds of the Christians of that day: “ They still worship that great man who was crucified in Palestine. . . . Moreover, their first Law-giver taught them that they were all brethren when once they had turned and renounced the gods of the Greeks, and worshiped their Master who was crucified, and engage to live according to his laws.”²⁶ Hierocles says that “ Christ was apprehended and crucified.”²⁷

β) *His Death.* Celsus says :

“ Those who were his associates while alive, on seeing him subjected to punishment and death, neither died with him nor for him; . . . whereas now you [Christians] die along with him.”²⁸ “ Seeing you are so eager for some novelty, how much better it would have been if you had chosen as the object of your zealous homage some one of those who died a glorious death,” rather than “ one who had ended a most infamous life by a most miserable death.”²⁹

The Talmud places the death of Jesus definitely at the time of the yearly service of the Jewish Passover, which accords with the Gospels. It says: “ The tradition is that on the evening of the Passover, Jesus was hanged [upon the cross]; they hanged him on the eve of the Passover.”³⁰ The rabbinical work called *Toledoth Jeshu* confirms the statement: “ Jesus was crucified and died on the eve of the Passover.” Tacitus, the celebrated Roman historian, states: “ Christ, the founder of that name, was put to death as a criminal by Pontius Pilate, procurator of Judæa, in the reign of Tiberius ”³¹ Cæsar.

A Syrian document of late discovery named *Mara*, which is of extra-Biblical character, is one of the very earliest heathen writings of the period. In reference to the Jews and their relation to the crucifixion of Jesus Christ, this document reads :

“ What benefit did the Jews obtain [by the execution] of their wise King, seeing that at that very time their kingdom was driven away [from them]? For with justice did God grant a recompense, . . . and

²⁵ *Ant.* xviii, 3, 3.
²⁷ *Ant.* 280.

²⁶ Schaff's *Person of Christ*, 201, and in *Peregrinus*, *Lard.* vii, 276.

²⁸ *Cels.* 11, 45.

²⁹ *Ib.* vii, 53.

³⁰ *Bab. Tal. Sanhedr.* 43, a.

³¹ *Annals*, xv, 44.

the Jews were brought to destruction, and expelled from their kingdom; and [now] are driven away into every land. Socrates did not die because of Plato; nor Pythagoras because of the statue of Hera; nor yet the wise King because of the new laws which he enacted.”³²

Dr. Heinrich Graetz, professor in the University of Breslau, Prussia, himself a Jew, and the recent author of a *History of the Jews*, says, touching the founding of Christianity:

“How was it possible to discover what was the secret of this sect? To bring that to light, it was necessary to tempt a traitor among his followers, and that traitor was found in Judas Iscariot, who, as it is related, incited by avarice, delivered up to the judges the man whom he had honored as the Messiah. The Christian authorities state that Jesus was nailed on the cross at nine o’clock in the morning, and that he expired at three o’clock in the afternoon. His last words were taken from a Psalm, and spoken in the Aramaic tongue: ‘God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?’ The Roman soldiers placed in mockery the following inscription upon the cross: ‘Jesus of Nazareth, King of the Jews.’ The cross had been erected, and the body was probably buried outside the town, on the spot which was the graveyard of condemned criminals. It was called Golgotha, the place of skulls.”

“Such was the end of the Man who had devoted himself to the improvement of the most neglected, miserable, and abandoned members of the people, and *who perhaps fell a victim to a misunderstanding. How great was the woe caused by that one execution! How many deaths and sufferings of every description has it not caused among the children of Israel! Millions of broken hearts and tragic fates have not atoned for his death! He is the only mortal of whom one can say, without exaggeration, that his death was more effective than his life. Golgotha, the place of skulls, became to the civilized world a new Sinai.*”³³

γ) *After Events.* Celsus once more witnesses to the preternatural darkness and to the earthquake which gave emphasis to the crucifixion, and occurred between the sixth and the ninth hour while Christ was dying. He says:

“You have discovered a becoming and credible termination to your drama in the voice from the cross, when he breathed his last, and in the earthquake and darkness.”³⁴ He makes “a taunt also of the blood of Jesus which was shed upon the cross,” saying, “What is the nature of the ichor in the body of the crucified Jesus? Is it such as flows in the bodies of the immortal gods?” “It is not the ichor such as flows in

³² *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, Vol. VIII, p. 737; Schaff, *Hist. Ch. Church*, I, 171, 172, last ed.

³³ *Hist. of Jews*, Eng. ed., pp. 163, 165, 166.

³⁴ *Cels.* ii, 55.

the veins of the blessed gods.”³⁵ Celsus adds: “You will not, I suppose, say of him that after failing to gain over those who were in this world, he went to Hades to gain over those who were there.”³⁶

Even the skeptical historian, Edward Gibbon, affirms the Scriptural account of the preternatural phenomenon when he says :

“Under the reign of Tiberius the whole earth, or at least a celebrated province of the Roman Empire, was involved in preternatural darkness for [the space of] three hours.”³⁷

In case of capital punishment it was the established custom of the Jews to cast out and leave exposed ignominiously the remains of executed malefactors, unless friends of the criminal made request of the authorities to take possession of the dead body for burial. This rule was observed in the case of Jesus. Great pains were taken to know that the man executed *was really dead* before the body was delivered over to the custody of the friends. How carefully the Romans observed this requirement is narrated in the sacred text. When Joseph of Arimathea, who was a member of the Jewish Sanhedrin, but had not consented to the death of Jesus, went to Pilate and requested the possession of our Lord's body, *it was not granted to him until the governor had ascertained that Jesus had indeed really died. This assurance was given, not through the friends of Christ, nor yet through the honored Sanhedrist Joseph, but his own Roman centurion,* who was the officer of the day, and in whose custody the body was kept. At the instance of the Jews, to hasten death, the soldiers approached and “brake the legs of the first and of the other who were crucified with him; but when they saw that he was dead already, they brake not his legs; but one of the soldiers with a spear pierced his side, and forthwith came there out blood*

* Tacitus calls this officer, “*exactor mortis.*”

³⁵ *Cels.* ii, 36; i, 66; comp. John xix, 34. ³⁶ *Ib.* ii, 43; comp. 1 Pet. iii, 19; iv, 6.

³⁷ *Decline and Fall of Rom. Empire*, I, 583, 584; comp. Matt. xxvii, 45; Luke xxiii, 44.

and water.”³⁸ In reference to the disposition of the body, Rabbi Frey says:

“Here we behold another instance of the interposing providence of God to fulfill the Scripture. Had the common and natural course of things taken place, if no friend had obtained the body of Jesus, it would have been ignominiously cast among the executed malefactors. But if his body had been thrown there, the prediction could not have been fulfilled.”³⁹

The *Toledoth Jeshu* relates that Jesus was buried *before the Jewish Sabbath began*, which is in exact accordance with the statements of the Evangelists. That is, the burial occurred on Friday evening, the day of the execution, before the set of sun, the Jewish Sabbath being Saturday, reckoning from sunset of the day before. John is the only Evangelist who locates the place of his sepulcher. He says:

“Now in the place where he was crucified there was a garden; and in the garden a new sepulcher wherein was never man yet laid; there laid they Jesus, therefore, because of the Jews’ preparation day; for the sepulcher was nigh at hand.”⁴⁰

The prophet Isaiah had predicted, “His rest shall be glorious,”⁴¹ which accords with the *Vulgate* version;⁴² a Scripture, which Abrabanel says, “may be expounded of Messiah’s honorable burial.”⁴³

REVIEW OF THE TESTIMONIES.

What is the state of the case as narrated by the Evangelist respecting the death of Christ as actually accomplished on the cross, and how has it been absolutely confirmed by Christ’s adversaries? This point is made unmistakably clear in the second Gospel. Mark, in his carefulness to give details with all correctness, narrates very circumstantially the several particulars which arose after the cruci-

³⁸ John xix, 31-37. ³⁹ *Messiahship of Jesus*, p. 260. See *Mishna Sanhed.* c. 1, §§ 5, 6; *Maimonides, Hilch. Sanhed.* c. 14, § 9.

⁴⁰ John xix, 41, 42.

⁴¹ Isa. xi, 10.

⁴² The *Vulgate* reads: “Erit sepulchrum ejus gloriosum”—*His grave shall be glorious*. The Rabbis refer this passage to the Messiah.

⁴³ R. Frey’s *Messiahship of Jesus*, 261.

fixion, preliminary to the burial of Christ's body. Incidentally, but fortunately for us, he employed terms which *are absolutely determinative of the case as to his death*. When Joseph requested leave to bury the body, Pilate was amazed that Jesus was already dead, and sent his trusted officer, the Roman centurion, to ascertain the exact state of the case, and then return and report to himself personally. Upon having learned the fact the following significant sentence occurs in the narration: "*And when he learned it of the centurion, he granted the corpse to Joseph.*"⁴⁴

About thirty circumstances in all connected with the crucifixion are recorded authentically in the Gospels, and are confirmed by adversaries. Celsus and the Talmud § 173. The Re- capitulation. mention the proffered vinegar and gall which Jesus refused on the cross; but the *Toledoth Jeshu* affirms that he afterwards received and drank the vinegar alone. To make the assurance of Christ's death doubly sure, the soldier pierced his side with the spear, whence flowed forth blood. Hence Celsus draws special attention to this fact and the "*ichor*," the supposed blood of the gods. Josephus relates that Jesus was condemned to the cross by Pilate; Hierocles, that he was "apprehended and crucified;" Lucian, that Jesus "was crucified in Palestine;" the *Toledoth*, that he was "crucified and died;" the Talmud, that his death occurred "on the evening of the Passover;" and the *Toledoth confirms the Talmud*.

The Roman historian Tacitus, with marked completeness, epitomizes all the essential facts in his own historical method. He gives the name *Christ* to the person who was executed; *the fact*, that he was put to death as a supposed criminal; *his place in history*, the Founder of the Christian name; *his execution*, by the order of Pontius Pilate; *the office of the ruler*, the procurator of the Romans; *the country which he ruled*, the

⁴⁴ Mark xv, 45, Rev. Vers. The Greek is remarkably explicit, τὸ πρῶμα, *the dead body*, in contradistinction from τὸ σῶμα, *the body* (living or dead).

province of Judæa; *the time of Pilate's ruling*, in the reign of Tiberius Cæsar. The statements of the Evangelists affirming the death of Jesus are verified as authentic and historical beyond recall by this one profane historian alone. The man who would deny it as a fact would not be benefited by any historical investigation. Moreover, the credibility of Tacitus is thus declared by the "free-thinking" Gibbon, whose dislike of Christianity was as cordial as it was unjust. In a single paragraph descriptive of the persecutions of the primitive Christians under the rule of the Emperor Nero, Gibbon says:

"The most skeptical criticism is obliged to respect the truth of this fact and the integrity of this celebrated passage of Tacitus. The former [its truth] is confirmed by the diligent Suetonius, who mentions the punishment which Nero inflicted upon the Christians; the latter [the integrity] may be proved by the consent of the most ancient manuscripts, by the inimitable character of Tacitus, and by his reputation, which guarded his text from interpolation," etc.⁴⁵

CHRISTIAN CONFIRMATIONS.

The first four Pauline Epistles, which are accepted by all living skeptics as thoroughly authentic and credible, confirm the witness of Celsus in respect to the doctrine of Christ's death as a Redeemer. Paul's testimony must stand for the teachings of all the apostles on this doctrine. It is in effect that in the sufferings and death of Jesus he made atonement for mankind; and that the atonement makes possible to all men the forgiveness of sins, and renders an endless salvation certain to all who believe on him to that end. It is to be noticed that the preternatural darkness witnessed by Celsus is amply confirmed by Christian Apologists. Paul teaches:

§ 174. Testimony of the Apostles.

"In due time Christ died for the ungodly. While we were yet sinners Christ died for us."⁴⁶ "And he died for all. God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself, not reckoning unto them their trespasses. Him who knew no sin he made to be a sin[offering] on our behalf."⁴⁷ "Our Lord Jesus Christ, who gave himself for our sins. Christ redeemed us from the curse of the law, having become a curse for us."⁴⁸

⁴⁵ *Decline and Fall of Rom. Emp.*, Milman's ed., Vol. 1, 602.

⁴⁶ Rom. v, 6, 8, 11.

⁴⁷ 2 Cor. v, 15, 19, 21.

⁴⁸ Gal, i, 4; iii, 13.

The teaching of the Apostolic Fathers, the pupils of the apostles, is to the same effect. Their teaching illustrates how they were apostolically taught.

§ 175. Testimony of the Apostolic Fathers. a) Barnabas: "It was necessary for him to suffer on the tree. Thou art taught concerning the cross and him that was crucified. If the Son of God . . . suffered that his wound might give us life, let us believe that the Son of God could not suffer except for our sakes."⁴⁹

β) Ignatius: "The Son of Mary . . . was truly persecuted under Pontius Pilate; was truly crucified and died in the sight of those in heaven, and those on earth, and those under the earth.⁵⁰ [He was] truly nailed up in the flesh for our sakes, under Pontius Pilate and Herod the tetrarch, . . . that he might be an ensign unto all ages.⁵¹ Be ye fully persuaded concerning the birth and passion, and the resurrection which took place in the time of the governorship of Pontius Pilate."⁵²

The witness of the Christian Apologists is of a little later date.

§ 176. Testimony of Christian Apologists. a) Aristides: "The Christians reckon the beginning of their religion from Jesus Christ, who is named the Son of God Most High."⁵³

β) Tertullian: "The Jews were so exasperated by his [Christ's] teachings by which the rulers and chiefs were convicted of the truth, chiefly because so many turned aside to him, that at last they brought him before Pontius Pilate, at that time governor of Syria, and by the violence of the outcries against him extorted a sentence giving him up to them to be crucified. . . . Nailed upon the cross, he exhibited many notable signs by which his death was distinguished from all others. . . . All these things Pilate did to Christ. . . . He sent word of him to the reigning Cæsar who was at that time Tiberius.⁵⁴ In the same hour, too [of his crucifixion], the light of day was withdrawn, when the sun at the very time was in his meridian blaze. Those who were not aware that this had been predicted about Christ no doubt thought it an eclipse. You yourselves have the account of the world-portent still in your archives."⁵⁵

γ) Jerome (b. about 330 A. D.): In his *Commentary on Matthew*⁵⁶ he remarks respecting the darkness which prevailed from the sixth to the ninth hour of Christ's crucifixion:

"They who have written against the Gospels suspect that the disciples of Christ, in their account of our Lord's resurrection, have mistaken the darkness which was only an eclipse of the sun that happens at cer-

⁴⁹ Barn. Epis. cc. 5, 12, 7, 8.

⁵⁰ Epis. to Tralls. c. 9.

⁵¹ Epis. to Smyrns. 1, 2.

⁵² Epis. to Mags. c. 11.

⁵³ Aris. *Apology*, p. 37.

⁵⁴ Tertull. *Apol.* c. 21.

⁵⁵ Tertull. *Apol.* c. 21.

⁵⁶ Matt. xxvii, 45.

tain seasons in the ordinary course of things; *whereas an eclipse of the sun can never happen but at the time of the new moon; and all the world knows that at the Passover it was full moon; and that there might be no pretense for saying that this darkness was owing to the shadow of the earth, or to an interposition of the moon between us and the sun, it is recorded to have continued for the space of three hours.*"

About sixty distinct circumstances and doctrines have been cited in this chapter, related to the sufferings, death, and burial of Jesus Christ. These are the fundamental §177. Conclusion. facts on which rest all the teachings of the New Testament. But for these as foundation, Christianity had never existed. Without them, Christianity would perish; with them, it can not be overthrown. They are facts substantiated as historical, in the first instance, by those of known hostility to this religion who lived in the first three Christian centuries. Their witness is confirmed by the concededly authentic Epistles of Paul, as well as by the apostles' successors, the Apostolic Fathers and the Christian Apologists, who defended the faith before the rulers of their times. Thus the continuity of current history is preserved in this evidence. But few questions of like early antiquity admit of such a wealth of clear and conclusive proof as do these facts recorded in the four Gospels. Can the foundation of this religion be true, and the superstructure be shown to be false? The capital facts being proved, can the teachings of the New Testament resting thereupon be disproved? The facts and evidence adduced legitimate the following

INDUCTIONS.

1. That Jesus Christ did actually die on the cross is true as all the Gospels state.
2. That this occurred in the rule of Pontius Pilate, and in the reign of the Emperor Tiberius.
3. That the event took place at Jerusalem, in Judæa, in a country called Palestine.

4. That the occasion taken for Christ's crucifixion, was at the Jewish Passover.
5. That his death was a realized fact exactly at the hour of the evening sacrifice.
6. That the apostolic teaching was, the death of Jesus was an atonement for mankind.
7. That the evidence adduced proves the antiquity and authenticity of the New Testament.

CHAPTER X.

THE RESURRECTION OF JESUS CHRIST.

I. INCIDENTS RELATED TO HIS RESURRECTION.

1. *The Resurrection and its Witnesses.*
2. *Movements of the Jewish Sanhedrists.*
3. *Story of the Roman Guard Incredible.*
4. *Attitude of Christ's Disciples.*

II. EVANGELISTS' NARRATIVES OF THE RESURRECTION.

- a) *Their Individual Accounts as given.*
- β) *Their several Christophanies Arranged.*
- γ) *The Ten Reappearances of Christ.*
- δ) *The Difficulties of the Narratives.*
- ε) *The several Difficulties Resolved.*

III. GOSPELS CONFIRMED BY THE ENEMIES OF CHRISTIANITY.

Celsus—Toledoth Jeshu—the Talmud.

IV. RECORROBORATIONS BY FRIENDS OF CHRISTIANITY.

- a) *Apostolic Fathers: Barnabas—Clement—Ignatius.*
- β) *Christian Apologists: Aristides—Tertullian—Origen.*
- γ) *Paul's Several Testimonies.*

V. MONUMENTAL EVIDENCE OF THE RESURRECTION.

- a. *The Christian Church.*
- b. *The Christian Sabbath.*

VI. MODERN THEORIES RESPECTING THE RESURRECTION.

- i. *The Theory that it was a Swoon.*
- ii. *The Theory of a Hallucination.*
- iii. *The Witness of Modern Skepticism.*
Dr. Keim—Dr. Ewald—Dr. Schenkel—Dr. Baur.

INDUCTIONS.

CHAPTER X.

THE RESURRECTION OF JESUS CHRIST.

§ 178. Sources: Biographical Epitomes, and Literature.

1. CLEMENT OF ROME (Epis. A. D. 95) was one of the most celebrated of the Apostolic Fathers. He was the pupil and companion of Paul, whom the apostle commends as one of those "fellow-laborers whose names are written in the Book of Life." (Phil. iv, 3.) Dr. Schaff regarded him as probably descended from the distinguished Flavian family, and hence related to the imperial household at Rome. He says: "The imperial household seems to have been the center of the Church at Rome from the time of Paul's imprisonment." (*Ch. Hist.* II, 638, n.) This is quite obvious from the apostle's own expressions: "My bonds in Christ are manifest in all the palace." "All the saints salute you, chiefly they that are of Cæsar's household." (Phil. i, 13; iv, 22.)

Clement was a man of noble character, of superior administrative abilities, and of great spirituality. Bryennios believed that for nine years he was Bishop of Rome. (Schaff, *Ch. Hist.* II, 638, n.) He died a natural death, about A. D. 100, in the third year of Trajan's reign. His epistle addressed to the Corinthians was written about 95 (Lightfoot), and it sought to compose an unhappy feud which had occurred in that Church occasioned by the illegal deposing of certain presbyters who had been rightfully made such by the apostles themselves. (Epis. xlv-xlvii.) The aggressive party had earlier been subject to discipline under Paul. (1 Cor. i, 12, 13.) Clement's epistle does not assume to have the authority of Divine inspiration, but is advisory in character. It consists of sixty-six chapters; and if we except the epistle of Barnabas (70-79), this is "the oldest Christian writing after the apostles." It is said to have been conveyed to the Church at Corinth by one Claudius Ephebus, Valerius Biton, and one Fortunatus, who endeavored to undo the wrong, restore the right, and, after conciliation, returned to Rome with assurances of peace.

2. POLYCARP (69-155) was the "last witness of the Apostolic Age." He was the disciple of the Apostle John. He was held in the highest reverence by those who knew him best, especially because of his very spiritual character. Even his heretical adversaries are said to

have coveted his gracious consideration. He was elevated to the episcopate about the year 104. Because of his previous relations with John, it is understood by many that our Lord's letter dictated in the Apocalypse referred to Polycarp when it was dedicated "To the Angel of the Church in Smyrna." (Rev. ii, 8-10.)

A letter had been sent by the Church at Philippi to the Bishop of Smyrna. The epistle of Polycarp is his reply. It was written soon after the death of Ignatius, the Bishop of Antioch, Syria. It answered inquiries respecting that event which occurred at Rome, mentioning Zosimus and Rufus (c. 9), who are understood to have accompanied Ignatius on his way to the Capital, and were present at his martyrdom. This epistle contains fourteen chapters, in which is found invaluable testimony respecting the crucifixion and the resurrection and ascension of our Lord, as well as the identity of the doctrines as taught with those in the New Testament.

3. FERDINAND CHRISTIAN BAUR (1792-1860), of Würtemberg, was elected Professor of Church History at Tübingen in 1826, where he founded his famous school of destructive criticism, and found a following by Strauss, Schwegler, and others. One of the most notable writings of history is his *Christianity and the Church in the First Three Centuries* (2 vols., London, 1878, 1879); also a treatise on *Paul*. He could see nothing in the history of the apostles to account for the strange power of Christianity, but the differences which he supposed to exist among the apostles in the controversy between Paul and Peter at Antioch. His hypothesis, however, has been thoroughly refuted by other writers of the destructive school. Baur employed the first four epistles of Paul (Romans, 1 Corinthians, 2 Corinthians, and Galatians) as authentic and credible to assail Christianity. If these epistles are good for *the attack*, they are equally good for *the defense*. All these epistles are credited now by all the destructive critics.
4. HEINRICH AUGUST VON EWALD, a famous Biblicist and a native of Göttingen. He was chosen Professor of Philosophy at the University of Göttingen in 1831, and again Professor of Oriental Languages in the same institution in 1835. In 1838 he went to Tübingen as Professor of Theology. His chief writings noted here were his *Hebrew Grammar*, *The Poetic Books of the Old Testament* (4 vols.); *A History of the People of Israel until the Advent of Christ* (7 vols.); *History of the Apostolic Age*; and the *Year-Book of Biblical Science*. Dr. Ewald belonged to the more learned and conservative critics. He was born in 1802, and died in 1875.
5. THEODORE KEIM (1825-1878) was a native of Würtemberg, a student in the University of Tübingen under the instruction of Baur in the study of Philosophy, Biblical Criticism, and Ecclesiastical History. He became tutor in the University of Bonn, also at

Tübingen (1851-1855), and subsequently was chosen Professor of Theology in the University of Zurich. His chief works are the *Reformation in Germany*; *The Historical Christ* (1866), a work which made him famous; and a *History of Jesus of Nazara* (3 vols., 1867-1872, Eng. ed. 6 vols., 1873). Dr. Keim was a moderate liberalist, very scholarly and very fair and candid.

6. MATTHEW ARNOLD (born 1822) was educated at Rugby and Oxford; became Professor of Poetry in 1857. Among his prose writings were his *Essays on Criticism* (in 1865); *St. Paul and Protestantism* (in 1870); *Literature and Dogma* (1873); *The Church and Religion* (1877); *Literature and Science* (1883, 1884), a course of Lectures in the United States. In theology, Dr. Arnold was a so-called liberalist.
7. RICHARD WHATELY (1787-1863) was an Anglican writer and prelate, born at London. He was educated at Oriel College, Oxford, where he graduated in 1812. He was the author of a work on *Logic*, and one on *Rhetoric*—works which won him much fame. He delivered a course of *Bampton Lectures* in 1822, on the *Uses and Abuses of Party Feeling in Religion*; and in 1819 he issued a remarkably ingenious work which was satirical in character on *Skepticism*, entitled *Historical Doubts Relative to the Existence of Napoleon Bonaparte*. His writings were quite numerous and very valuable, indicating keen insight and scholarly acuteness. He also added his *Annotations to Paley's Evidences of Christianity*, which also are valuable.
8. W. BEYSCHLAG, an orthodox writer of Germany, who, however, brought criticism upon him and his class of thinkers by his *Essay* written and published at Altenburg in 1864, in which he contended in Christology for two separate natures in Christ, amounting to dualism in his personal life, and denied Christ's pre-existence as a personality, and, by consequence, denying the Incarnation of Jesus Christ.

§179. The Resurrection of Jesus Christ.

The history of the life of Christ on earth closes with a miracle as great as that of its inception.—DR. EDERSHEIM.

Nothing is historically more certain than that Christ rose from the dead and appeared to his own [disciples], and that this their vision was the beginning of a new, higher faith, and of all their Christian labors.—DR. EWALD.

Nothing but the miracle of the resurrection could disperse the doubts which threatened to drive faith into the eternal night of death. For the faith of the disciples of Jesus became the most solid and the most irrefutable certainty.—F. C. BAUR.

The unhesitating denial of the resurrection, in spite of the serious difficulties which exist in conflict with the belief of so many among the laity, is the fruit of neither a scientific nor a religious conscience. We are not able to comprehend how the Christian Church, with all its clearness of mind, with all its earnestness of moral purpose, could have been founded as the result of over-excited visions.—DR. KEIM.

We feel how boundless is the caprice which would remove the glorious solution from the history of the life of Jesus, and transfer it henceforth to the history of the apostles and their self-deception.—DR. VAN OOSTERZEE.

It is infinitely easier to admit that the Christian Church is the offspring of a miracle than to imagine it to be born of a lie.—BEYSCHLAG.

ARGUMENT.

That same Jesus who was crucified, and was dead and buried in a sepulcher of stone, arose and reappeared in bodily form and life on the third day. He was seen alive by his disciples, with whom he continued in familiar intercourse for the space of forty days. To the understanding of both friends and foes his resurrection was at first a stumbling-block, and was rejected by them alike as untrue. Neither accepted it until the fact had demonstrated its reality to their personal senses and consciousness. Neither was prepared for such a miraculous event, which began at once and continues yet to revolutionize the faiths of the world. The enemies of Christianity have ever sought to deny this marvelous occurrence which they have never been able to refute—this imperishable fact and truth upon which the Christian religion reposes as its foundation.

The story invented by the Jews to be circulated by the soldiery, that the body of Jesus was stolen by night, is found to be transparently false, as it is preposterously absurd. And so far from being grounded in the mental hallucination of the apostles, the rising of Jesus from the sepulcher of death was a surprise to mankind, as it was the glory of the Redeemer, and the source of exhaustless consolation and joy to the redeemed; a fact whose power continues to this day, and will continue until the end of time, to influence the thought and order the character of the best portion of mankind. There are two monuments of his resurrection, the Christian Church and the Christian Sabbath.

1. Incidents related to his Resurrection.
2. The True History of his Resurrection.
3. Confirmatory Proof of his Resurrection.
4. Monumental Evidence of his Resurrection.
5. Modern Theories of his Resurrection.

Lord Lyndhurst died in 1863, after having been Lord Chancellor of England for the fourth time. During his last illness, and near its end, a friend visited him, and found him occupying his mind with a pile of infidel works, gleaning the strongest objections adduced against the resurrection of Jesus Christ.

§180. Lord Lyndhurst and Matthew Arnold.

This great judicial mind had been carefully investigating the evidence of this capital fact of Christianity, when, turning to his friend, he said: "Of evidence I may be allowed to be as competent a judge as most men, and *it is my opinion that such evidence as might be adduced for the resurrection of Christ has never broken down.*" Dr. Matthew Arnold, a critic and a man not suspected of too much leaning toward orthodoxy, did not hesitate to say: "I have been used for many years to study the history of other times, and to examine and weigh the evidence of those who have written about them, and I know of no fact in the history of mankind which is proved by better or fuller evidence of every sort, to the mind of a fair inquirer, than the great sign that God has given us that Christ died and rose again from the dead." This subject has been an open challenge for honest investigation for nearly two thousand years.

I. SIGNIFICANT INCIDENTS OF THE CASE STATED.

No believer in Christ saw Jesus in the act of rising from the dead. No sacred writer affirms that the eyes of man beheld him in the glory of that supreme moment. Exactly what they state is, that when his friends on the third morning looked into the sepulcher to find the lifeless body of their Lord, to their surprise it had disappeared, and they found only an empty tomb! However, this is far from saying that there were no witnesses of Christ's resurrection; for with one united voice, in private and in public, before friends and before foes, in the presence of the multitude in the temple and before the Sanhedrin, the Jews' senate

§181. Resurrection and Witnesses.

of judicature, on all occasions and in all places, immediately after the wondrous occurrence, and ever afterwards, without explanation, without qualification, and without hesitation, the apostles claimed and proclaimed themselves as witnesses of the fact of Christ's resurrection from the dead. *They distinctly affirm the event, not upon the transient sight in seeing him rising out of the sepulcher, but upon that more enduring ground, his reappearance and continuance in closest personal relation with themselves for the space of forty days after he had risen.* This is the sum of their testimony:

“He showed himself alive after his passion, by many infallible proofs, being seen of them forty days, and speaking of the things pertaining to the kingdom of God.”¹ “Him God raised up the third day and showed him openly . . . unto witnesses chosen before of God, even to us who did eat and drink with him after he rose from the dead.”² “*This Jesus did God raise up, whereof we all are witnesses.*”³

If the eyes of man did indeed behold Jesus in his resurrection thus attested, it was not his friends who saw him rise, but the Roman guard granted by Pilate at the Jews' request, who were stationed as watchers over Christ's lifeless body in the tomb. For some reason, on Friday evening the high priests, who were Sadducees, and the Pharisees who believed in the resurrection of the dead, became keenly apprehensive of possible occurrences, and were extremely careful concerning things which might happen. The tumultuous and exhaustive scenes of the crucifixion had closed, followed by the generous hush of the night; but the Jewish leaders became more thoughtful, reflective, and restless. For once the Pharisees and Sadducees make common cause, and go together to Pilate, saying, “Sir, we remember that that deceiver said while he was yet alive, After three days I will rise again.⁴ Command therefore that the sepulcher be made sure until the third day, lest his disciples come by night and steal him away, and they say unto

§182. Move-
ments of
Adversaries.

¹Acts 1, 3.

²Ib. x, 40, 41.

³Ib. 11, 32.

⁴Matt. xxvii, 62-66.

the people, He is risen from the dead; so the last error shall be worse than the first." Their request was reasonable and readily granted them, and every precaution was then taken under their own direction against possible imposture. "Pilate said unto them, Ye have a guard: go make it as sure as ye can. So they went and made the sepulcher sure, sealing the stone, the guard being with them." The great stone at the door is placed, the seal of the Roman ruler is set upon it, the molestation of which is death; the watchers charged with the custody of the body are posted; and in the silence of the night, broken only by the tramp of the guard outside on duty, all are waiting and watching for the issues of the morning. But a surprise came upon them from an unexpected quarter with the early dawn. It was not the stealthy approach of the disciples as anticipated, whom weapons might easily subdue, but dumb Nature herself struggling convulsively to articulate and give emphasis to the hour. "There was a great earthquake; for an angel of the Lord descended from heaven and came and rolled away the stone and sat upon it. His appearance was like lightning, and his raiment white as snow; and for fear of him, the keepers did shake and became as dead men."

"Some of the guard" hasten into the city to tell the "chief priests all things that were come to pass."⁵ What could have been the burden of that report, other than that Jesus had risen and forsaken that sepulcher? §183. The Story of the Roman Guard. *Something must have happened or they would not have hastened to make a report at all. They would have had no report to make.* It must have been something that interested the Jews, in whose special interest they had been guarding the tomb; for they go first to the high priests to report, instead of to Pilate, the Roman procurator, or to their own military officer. It was something which interested the soldiers; for the supreme matter with them was that they

⁵ Matt. xxviii, 4, 11-15.

were charged with the keeping of the body in their own custody in the sepulcher. No report of "all things that had come to pass" could have been made leaving out the one capital fact that Jesus had risen from the dead. They afterwards confess that the body of Jesus was missing, however they would account for it. Something did occur, and it was that something to which the earthquake and the descending angel were but the background giving prominence to the picture. They go, therefore, to the high priests first, who were especially interested to know what had become of the body of Jesus, which had been placed under their care. It is evident and obvious that all prior arrangements had this one object in view,—to have the custody of the dead man in his sepulcher in their own power until the third day. Now, how could the guard tell all the occurrences of the morning unless they themselves had witnessed them? There were no other parties to inform them of the facts. If, then, mortal eyes did see Jesus in the very act of rising, it was not his friends who were the first to witness and tell it, but the enemies of Jesus who attested it, while heaven and earth combined to demonstrate its certainty.

Upon the arrival of the guard, and hearing their report of all that had occurred, the high priests assemble the Sanhedrists to consider the unaccountable situation. Nothing could be more natural than that the guard should tell their story to them in a simple and straightforward manner in the soldierly consciousness of duty faithfully performed. *The Sanhedrists do not challenge any part of the account rendered by the soldiers.* So far as appears, their report was thoroughly accepted and believed by these Jewish rulers. Indeed, the Jewish officials could not, if they would, deny that the body of Jesus was gone, and nothing left to them but the empty tomb. With a sense of terrible disaster do the Council apprehend the new situation, especially in view of their own past conduct in mocking the sufferings of Christ on the cross, and the failure of their

§184. Procedure of the Sanhedrin.

precautions against all possible defeat. If the fact that Jesus had actually risen should get abroad, no one could predict what results might follow affecting the Jewish theocracy and the nation.⁶ Two distinguished members of the Sanhedrin had begged and buried his body; the chief priests and Pharisees had urgently solicited the guard to hold the custody of his tomb and enforce its security. The Jews and Romans had combined to defeat the resurrection of Jesus, "lest his disciples . . . say unto the people, He is risen from the dead; so the last error shall be worse than the first." But now all these plans have come to naught. The elders counsel together, for something must be done. There is no possible explanation to give the people of what has occurred. In the consciousness of the Sanhedrists, whatever else be allowed to have happened, the resurrection of the man of Nazareth *must be denied outright and at all hazards!* If they will not tell the truth, they must fabricate the lie, and so escape the dilemma. No other course is open to them. If his rising from the dead must be denied, they must give out the report that his dead body was stolen away, as they at first anticipated it might be. So the Jewish course is resolved upon. "They gave large money unto the soldiers, saying, Say ye, His disciples came by night and stole him away while we slept; and if this come to the governor's ears, we will persuade him and rid you of care. So they took the money, and did as they were taught; and this saying was spread abroad among the Jews, and continueth until this day."*

*About a hundred years after the crucifixion, in his discussion with the Jew Trypho, Justin Martyr says: "Jesus expected you to repent of your wickedness [in crucifying him] *at least after he rose from the dead*, and to mourn as did the Ninevites in order that your nation and city might not be destroyed; yet you have not repented after you have learned that he rose from the dead; but [instead] . . . you sent men throughout all the world to proclaim that a godless and lawless heresy had sprung from one Jesus, a Galilean deceiver whom we crucified; but his disciples stole him away from the tomb where he was laid, unfastened from the cross, and now deceiving men by asserting that he has risen from the dead and ascended to heaven." "When you knew that he had risen from the dead and ascended into heaven, as the prophets had foretold that he would, . . . you selected and sent out from Jerusalem chosen men through all the land to tell that the godless heresy of the Christians had sprung up, and to publish those things which all they who knew us not, speak against us. (*Dialogue*, cviii and xvii.)

⁶Compare Acts v, 24, 28, and John xi, 48.

But the explanation is simply incredible. It is incredible that the disciples would have stolen the dead body if they §185 ^{The Story} could; and it is incredible that they could have ^{Incredible.} stolen it if they would. For how could it possibly advantage the disciples that they should violate the repose of the dead and rob the grave of its possession, since the body of Jesus had already received a royal sepulture in the new tomb of Joseph of Arimathea? And in the presence of the armed soldiers on guard, how could the disciples steal in upon the watch, break the great seal, the molestation of which was death, roll away the great stone successfully, and carry away the dead, without detection? If the guard were awake, they were stationed there expressly to prevent it; if they were asleep, how did they know that the disciples had stolen the body away? It is incredible that the disciples who, through fright, forsook Jesus at Gethsemane when he was arrested, leaving him in the hands of his enemies and to his fate, should approach the sepulcher, and, unlike the conduct of thieves, arrange and leave everything in order, putting the linens⁷ in one place and the napkin of his head in another, instead of hurrying away with the body, as is alleged. It is incredible that the soldiers all, and all at once, had fallen asleep on duty, when sleeping on duty meant the forfeiture of their lives. And especially it is incredible, because it is supremely preposterous, for Jews or Romans, or both together, to assert that Christ's disciples had come and stolen him away, and that they knew it by this circumstance: *that they were themselves asleep while they witnessed it!* And it is just as absurd as it is incredible that the Sanhedrists should have felt necessitated *to bribe the soldiery to tell the truth* respecting what they had seen. Unquestionably money in large sums has been used by corrupt men to suppress the truth and falsify; but where in history is there a body of men who had

⁷ Τὰ ὀθόνια . . . ἐντυλίσω, *to enfold as linen grave-clothes*; comp. Luke xxiv, 12; xxiii, 53; and John xi, 44; xix, 40.

to be bought to affirm and put in circulation any statement *unless they knew it to be false?* Notably, those who are capable of bribing are capable of falsification. These corrupt officials who bribed Judas for treachery, afterwards suborned witnesses against Stephen; and in this instance they both bribe the soldiers and instigate them to perjury.⁸ The whole procedure on the part of the Sanhedrists and soldiers carries on its face the ingrained evidence of an undisguised falsehood and fraud, as self-contradictory as it is self-criminating. What wonder that the story was relegated by the thoughtful to a deserved infamy, from the earliest Christian antiquity! And are we asked to believe that this was the origin of Christianity! Truly, as Beyschlag has forcefully remarked, "*It is easier to admit that the Christian Church is the offspring of a miracle than to imagine it to be born of a lie!*"

The mental attitude of Christ's followers upon receiving the first information of his rising, was anything but favorable to a belief in his resurrection. Obviously the disciples did not anticipate the event, and its occurrence took them completely by surprise. Repeatedly had Jesus predicted and emphasized the fact before his crucifixion, in order that his followers might be prepared for the awful issue involved in the tragedy of redemption, and be upborne by the hope of his rising while he slept the sleep of death; but as often did they fail utterly in the great comprehension. "For as yet they knew not the Scriptures, that he must rise again from the dead."⁹ In absolute disappointment and despair they buried in his sepulcher all their anticipations of his kingdom and of himself as the coming ruler of Israel. Their sorrow was as simple as it was sincere and pathetic. It is with inimitable simplicity that the Evangelists relate how Mary Magdalene, having seen the Lord on the morning of the resurrection, "went and told them that she had been with

§186. Attitude
of the
Disciples.

⁸ See Matt. xxvi, 15; xxvii, 3-10; and Acts vi, 11.

⁹ John xx, 9; Luke xxiv, 27, 45.

him;" but they only "mourned and wept, and when they heard that he was alive and had been seen of her, *they believed [her] not.*"¹⁰ Then, after he had been seen of the other women, they all went together and "told these things unto the apostles;" but "*their words seemed to them as idle tales, and they believed them not!*"¹¹ It is not wonderful, then, that when Peter visited his empty tomb with John, he "departed to his home, wondering at that which was come to pass."¹² The two disciples of the Seventy who walked and talked with Jesus on the way to Emmaus, when rehearsing to him the incidents of his own crucifixion, added yet this:

"Yea, and certain of our women made us astonished who were early at the sepulcher, . . . who said that he was alive." "Then opened he their understanding that they might understand the Scriptures." "In the breaking of bread their eyes were opened, and they knew him; and he vanished out of their sight."¹³ "And they rose up the same hour and returned to Jerusalem and found the eleven gathered together, and them that were with them, saying, The Lord is risen indeed, and hath appeared unto Simon. And they told what things were done in the way, and how he was known of them in the breaking of bread. And as they thus spake, Jesus himself stood in the midst of them, and saith unto them, Peace be unto you. But they were terrified and affrighted, and supposed they had seen a spirit."¹⁴

These disciples then told Thomas that they had seen the Lord; but he rejected their testimony, refusing absolutely to believe in the stupendous occurrence, demanding both ocular and tangible demonstration to the senses before he would believe. One week afterward the apostles were again assembled together, when suddenly Jesus "stood in the midst of them," and turning to Thomas, in the very language of his challenge of their faith, Jesus said: "Thomas, reach hither thy finger, and see my hands; and reach hither thy hand and put it into my side, and be not faithless but believing." And Thomas in response exclaimed, "My Lord and my God!"¹⁵

These facts are fatal to any theory which ascribes the resurrection of Jesus to a mere preoccupation of belief, or anticipation

¹⁰ Mark xvi, 10, 11.

¹³ *Ib.* xxiv, 22, 23, 45, 46, 31, 35.

¹¹ Luke xxiv, 10, 11.

¹⁴ *Ib.* xxiv, 33-37.

¹² *Ib.* xxiv, 12.

¹⁵ John xx, 24-28.

of mind on the part of the disciples; for so far from expecting the event, they all in common absolutely rejected the testimony of others when they first affirmed that they had again seen him alive. *Something revolutionized their conviction, for their sorrow was turned into indescribable joy,¹⁶ and in the face of all dangers they began at once to publish outright that very truth which they had previously rejected. They lived and died in this faith; and no man living has ever been willing to live and die for a lie, he knowing it to be such.*

II. THE NARRATIONS OF CHRIST'S RESURRECTION.

A visit was made to the sepulcher by Mary Magdalene and the other Galilean women on Saturday night, which was "the end of the [Jewish] Sabbath."¹⁷ "And the women also who came with him from Galilee ^{§187. The Evening and the Morning.} followed after, and beheld the sepulcher, and how his body was laid."¹⁸ Three visits were made to the sepulcher on the morning of "the first day of the week:" (a) By Mary and the other women from Galilee, who seem not to have been informed of the special arrangements effected between the chief Jews and Pilate relating to the posted guard, and the sealed stone, and so brought sweet spices to embalm the body of Jesus.¹⁹ (b) After Mary had fled from the tomb in haste to report the empty sepulcher to Peter and John, these two disciples ran together to the sepulcher to learn about the body which had disappeared.²⁰ (c) Mary Magdalene followed Peter and John, and returned to the tomb of Jesus.²¹ The case was this:

1. Mary Magdalene, accompanied by the Galilean women,²² went to the tomb together "at the early dawn,"²³ on the first

¹⁶ Matt. xxviii, 8; Luke xxiv, 41.

¹⁷ Ὁψὲ δὲ σαββάτων, "at the close of the Sabbaths;" i. e., Saturday at sunset. Matt. xxviii, 1. "The end of the Sabbath was at sunset the night before." (Alford.)

¹⁸ Luke xxiii, 55; xxiv, 1; Matt. xxviii, 1; Mark xvi, 1.

¹⁹ Comp. Matt. xxviii, 1; Mark xvi, 1, 2; Luke xxiii, 55; John xx, 1.

²⁰ John xx, 3, 4.

²¹ *Ib.* xx, 2-4, 11.

²² Mark xvi, 1, 2; Luke xxiii, 55; xxiv, 1, 10. ²³ Luke xxiv, 1, Rev. Version.

day of the week. At the instant that Mary discovered the body was gone, she fled in dismay and distress to inform Peter and John of these facts.

“She runneth and cometh to Simon Peter and the other disciple, whom Jesus loved, and saith unto them, They have taken away the Lord out of the sepulcher, and we know not where they have laid him!”²⁴

2. Thereupon both Peter and John ran together to the tomb, leaving Mary to follow them more leisurely. John arrives first and looks into the sepulcher; Peter follows closely after and enters into the tomb.

“So they ran both together, and the other disciple did outrun Peter and came first to the sepulcher, and stooping down saw the linen clothes lying, yet went he not in. Then came Simon Peter following him, and went into the sepulcher, and seeth the linen clothes lie, and the napkin that was about his head.” John “saw and believed;” Peter “departed wondering in himself at that which had come to pass.” “Then the disciples went away again to their own home.”²⁵

3. During the Magdalene’s absence from the tomb to tell these two apostles of the body that was missing, an angel appears to the other women who remained at the sepulcher, and informed them that Jesus had risen. The angel sends a message in haste by them to the disciples that they should meet Jesus in Galilee as he had foretold them. On their way with this message, Jesus met the women.

“They departed from the tomb with fear and great joy, and ran to bring the disciples word. And as they went to tell his disciples, behold, Jesus met them saying, All hail! And they came and held him by the feet and worshiped him. Then said Jesus unto them, Be not afraid; go and tell my brethren that they go into Galilee, and there shall they see me.” “And go quickly and tell his disciples he is risen from the dead.”²⁶

Meantime, as the other women were about leaving the tomb in haste, Mary returned alone, following Peter and John, standing outside the sepulcher weeping. She looks into the tomb and sees two angels.

²⁴John xx, 2.

²⁵*Ib.* xx, 3-8, 10; Luke xxiv, 12.

²⁶Matt. xxviii, 7-10.

“And as she wept she stooped down and looked into the sepulcher, and seeth two angels sitting the one at the head, and the other at the feet where the body of Jesus had lain. . . . She saith unto them: Because they have taken away my Lord, and I know not where they have laid him. And when she had thus said, she turned herself back and saw Jesus standing, and knew not that it was Jesus. . . . She, supposing him to be the gardener, saith unto him, Sir, if thou hast borne him hence tell me where thou hast laid him, and I will take him away. Jesus saith unto her, MARY! She turneth herself, and saith unto him, RABBONI,* which is to say, Master. Mary Magdalene came and told the disciples that she had seen the Lord, and that he had spoken these things unto her.”²⁷

a) THE EVANGELISTS' ACCOUNTS INDIVIDUALLY.

1. Matthew mentions *only two appearances* of Christ after his rising: (1) To the women when on the way bearing the angel's message to the apostles, on the morning of the resurrection;²⁸ and (2) To the eleven disciples on a mountain in Galilee.²⁹ § 188. The Number of Appearances.

2. Mark mentions *three appearances*: (1) To Mary Magdalene alone at the sepulcher;³⁰ (2) To Cleopas and another disciple on the way to and at Emmaus;³¹ (3) To the ten disciples at Jerusalem on that night, Thomas being absent.³²

3. Luke mentions *four appearances*: (1) To the two of the seventy disciples at Emmaus;³³ (2) To Simon Peter alone—the fact but not the circumstances named;³⁴ (3) To the ten apostles on the first night at Jerusalem;³⁵ (4) To the eleven disciples who received their commission, where Jesus ascended into heaven.³⁶

4. John mentions *four appearances*: (1) To Mary Magdalene alone as already described;³⁷ (2) To the ten apostles at Jerusalem, Thomas being absent;³⁸ (3) To the eleven together one week later, Thomas being present;³⁹ (4) To the seven at the Sea of Tiberias in Galilee.⁴⁰

* There were three titles of distinction given to the Jewish teachers, representing three different degrees: viz., *Rab* (רַב) = “Master;” *Rabbi* (רַבִּי) = “My Master;” and *Rabboni* (רַבּוֹנִי), Greek, *Ῥαββουλί*, or *Ῥαββουλί*, but sometimes *Rabban* (רַבָּן) = “My great Master.” It is not certain whether the *first* was in use in Christ's time.

²⁷ John xx, 11-16, 18. ²⁸ Matt. xxviii, 8-10. ²⁹ *Ib.* xxviii, 10, 16. ³⁰ Mark xvi, 9.

³¹ Mark xvi, 12, 13; Luke xxiv, 13-18, 30, 31. ³² Mark xvi, 14.

³³ Luke xxiv, 13, 31. ³⁴ *Ib.* xxiv, 34; 1 Cor. xv, 5.

³⁵ *Ib.* xxiv, 33, 36-48. ³⁶ *Ib.* xxiv, 47, 49, 50-53. ³⁷ John xx, 11-17

³⁸ *Ib.* xx, 19-24. ³⁹ *Ib.* xx, 26-29. ⁴⁰ *Ib.* xxi, 1-14.

To these instances cited by the evangelists severally may be added those of the Apostle Paul:

5. Paul mentions *six* appearances; (1) To Cephas, otherwise called Simon Peter;⁴¹ (2) To James the brother of our Lord, apart from the apostles; (3) To those disciples formerly designated "the Twelve;" (4) To the five hundred at once in the mountains of Galilee; (5) To "all the apostles" together, probably at Jerusalem; (6) "And last of all" to Paul also as "one born out of due time."⁴²

β) THE SEVERAL CHRISTOPHANIES ARRANGED.

The actual number of Christ's reappearances after his resurrection, and the order of their occurrence, are unknown.

§ 189. Arrange-
ment of the
Christophanies. The sacred writers do not profess to have recorded *all* his reappearances, or their regularity. We have, consequently, no *data* for determining these questions with certainty; but allowing time sufficient for the apostles to travel to Galilee where Jesus had promised to meet them, and then return to Jerusalem, they were probably in full fellowship with him during the forty days intervening his resurrection and his ascension: "*being seen of them forty days.*"⁴³ If seen of them forty days, he must have been seen of them forty times at least.

γ) THE TEN REAPPEARANCES OF CHRIST.

First Reappearance of Jesus Christ.

"He appeared first to Mary Magdalene"⁴⁴ when she came the second time to the sepulcher on the morning of the first day of the week, and stood weeping outside the tomb. Jesus saith unto her, Mary! She responded, Rabboni! "Mary Magdalene cometh and telleth the disciples, I have seen the Lord, and how he had said these things unto her."⁴⁵

Second Reappearance of Jesus Christ.

The women from Galilee bring spices to the sepulcher, finding the stone rolled away, "enter into the tomb and found not the body of the Lord Jesus."⁴⁶

⁴¹ Luke xxiv, 34; 1 Cor. xv, 5.

⁴⁴ Mark xvi, 9.

⁴² 1 Cor. xv, 6-8.

⁴⁵ John xx, 11-18.

⁴³ Acts i, 3.

⁴⁶ Luke xxiv, 1-8.

But they saw "two men in dazzling apparel" and "were afraid." "They said to the women, Why seek ye the living among the dead? He is not here but risen. Remember how he spake unto you when he was yet in Galilee, saying that the Son of man must be delivered up into the hands of sinful men, and be crucified, and the third day rise again; and they remembered his words."⁴⁷ "Then the angel saith unto them, Go tell his disciples and Peter that he goeth before them into Galilee; there shall ye see him, as he said unto you. And they went out and fled from the tomb."⁴⁸ "And they departed quickly from the tomb with fear and great joy, and ran to bring the disciples word."⁴⁹ "For trembling and astonishment had come upon them; and they said nothing to any one, for they were afraid."⁵⁰ "Now they were Mary Magdalene, and Joanna, and Mary the mother of James, and the other women [from Galilee] with them, and told these things unto the apostles."⁵¹ "And behold Jesus met them saying, All hail! And they came and took hold of his feet and worshiped him. Then saith Jesus unto them, Fear not; go tell my brethren that they depart into Galilee, and there shall they see me."⁵²

Third Reappearance of Jesus Christ.

The third appearance of the risen Jesus was to Simon Peter. The sacred writer gives no circumstantial account of it. But the angel sent a message to him specially by the women; and *the fact* that Peter did see Jesus alive again is duly recorded as having occurred on the day of the resurrection, and told by the eleven and those with them to the two disciples of the Seventy upon their return to Jerusalem from Emmaus, and also by Paul.

The angel "saith unto them [the women], . . . Go your way; tell his disciples and Peter that he goeth before you into Galilee; there shall ye see him, as he said unto you."⁵³ "And they rose up that same hour and returned [from Emmaus] to Jerusalem, and found the eleven gathered together, and them that were with them saying, The Lord is risen indeed and hath appeared to Simon."⁵⁴ "He rose from the dead on the third day, according to the Scriptures, . . . and was seen of Cephas⁵⁵ [Peter], then of the twelve."^{*}

* It should be noticed that "the Twelve," without Judas, particularizes not the specific number, but that particular class of disciples, *as that class*, in distinction from "the Seventy;" *i. e.*, meaning those disciples who had formerly constituted and passed under the appellation of "the Twelve." Comp. Matt. x, 2-5, and Luke x, 1, 17; xxiv, 33.

⁴⁷ Luke xxiv, 4-9.

⁵⁰ Mark xvi, 8.

⁵³ Mark xiv, 28; xvi, 7.

⁵¹ 1 Cor. xv, 4, 5.

⁴⁸ Mark xvi, 7, 8.

⁵¹ Luke xxiv, 1-10.

⁵⁴ Luke xxiv, 33, 34; 1 Cor. xv, 5.

⁴⁹ Matt. xxviii, 8.

⁵² Matt. xxviii, 9, 10.

Fourth Reappearance of Jesus Christ.

On the day that Jesus rose, two of the seventy disciples went to the village called Emmaus, which was "threescore furlongs" distant from Jerusalem, or about seven and a half miles. One of the two is named Cleopas, and "another disciple" *tradition* mentions as being Luke, as no one but one of the party could have furnished so sharp and circumstantial an account as that which he narrates of what happened in the course of its movements.⁵⁶ Jesus, unrecognized, joins their company, and they rehearse the sad particulars of his own crucifixion, and the morning rumor that Jesus had risen from the dead, and they say:

"Certain women of our company amazed us, having been early at the tomb, and when they found not his body, they came saying that they had seen a vision of angels who said that he was alive. And certain of them that were with us went to the tomb and found it even as the women had said; but him they saw not." "And it came to pass when he had sat down with them he took bread and blessed, and, breaking it, he gave it to them; and their eyes were opened, and they knew him; and he vanished out of their sight."⁵⁷

Fifth Reappearance of Jesus Christ.

On the evening of the same day these two disciples, having returned to Jerusalem, found the ten apostles together, Thomas being absent; and they reported unto the apostles the occurrences of the day on their journey, and were told that Peter also had seen the risen Jesus.* They were informed:

"The Lord is risen indeed, and hath appeared unto Simon. And they told what things were done in the way, and how he was known of them in the breaking of bread."⁵⁸ So "they went and told it unto the residue, neither believed they them."⁵⁹ "And as they thus spake Jesus

*The first *individual* to whom the risen Christ appeared was Mary Magdalene (Mark xvi, 9); the first of "*the twelve disciples*" was Simon Peter (Luke xxiv, 33, 34; 1 Cor. xv, 5); the first of the ten *disciples collectively* was on the first night at Jerusalem, Thomas being absent (Luke xxiv, 33, 34; John xx, 19, 20, 24); the first time to the seventy disciples was to the two journeying to Emmaus (Luke xxiv, 13, 18). His *last* appearance was at the ascension (Luke xxiv, 50, 51; Mark xvi, 19). Besides, he was seen thrice afterwards in heaven: once by John (Rev. i, 1-8, 18); once by Stephen (Acts vii, 56, 59); and once by Paul (Acts ix, 1-9; xxii, xxvi; 1 Cor. xv, 8; Gal. i, 11, 12).

⁵⁶Luke xxiv, 13-35.

⁵⁷Luke xxiv, 22-24, 30, 31; comp. Mark xvi, 12, 13.

⁵⁸Luke xxiv, 34, 35; 1 Cor. xv, 5.

⁵⁹Mark xvi, 12, 13.

himself stood in the midst of them, and saith unto them, Peace be unto you. But they were terrified and affrighted, and supposed that they had seen a spirit. And he said unto them, Why are ye troubled, and why do thoughts ["troubles"] arise in your hearts? Behold my hands and my feet, that it is I myself; handle me and see; for a spirit hath not flesh and bones as ye see me have. And when he had thus spoken unto them, he showed unto them his hands and his feet,"⁶⁰ "and his side. Then were the disciples glad when they saw the Lord."⁶¹

This was the same time when Jesus "appeared unto the eleven as they sat at meat, and upbraided them with their unbelief and hardness of heart, because they believed not them who had seen him after he was risen."⁶² After this they said to Thomas, "We have seen the Lord!"⁶³ But Thomas refused their testimony.⁶⁴

Sixth Reappearance of Jesus Christ.

It was just one week later, according to the Jewish method of reckoning which was inclusive of the two appearances, when Jesus appeared to the disciples again. Turning to that disciple, the Lord employs the very language which he had employed as his demand before he would believe Christ risen when he challenged the testimony of his fellow-disciples. Jesus said:

"Reach hither thy finger, and behold my hands; and reach hither thy hand and put into my side, and be not faithless but believing. Thomas answered and said unto him, My Lord and my God! Jesus saith unto him, Because thou hast seen me, thou hast believed; blessed are they that have not seen, and yet have believed."⁶⁵

Seventh Reappearance of Jesus Christ.

Just before his passion the Lord foretold to his disciples how that very night they would be scattered like sheep without a shepherd, adding, "But after I am raised up, I will go before you into Galilee."⁶⁶ The angel at the tomb reminded them of this statement of the Master:

"He goeth before you into Galilee; there shall ye see him as he said unto you."⁶⁷ "And they remembered his words."⁶⁸ "Then the eleven disciples went away into Galilee, into a mountain where Jesus

⁶⁰ Luke xxiv, 36-40.

⁶³ John xx, 24, 25.

⁶⁶ Matt. xxvi, 32.

⁶¹ John xx, 20.

⁶⁴ John xx, 24, 25.

⁶⁷ Mark xvi, 7.

⁶² Mark xvi, 14.

⁶⁵ John xx, 26-29.

⁶⁸ Luke xxiv, 6, 8.

had appointed them; and when they saw him, they worshiped him."⁶⁹ "After these things Jesus showed himself again to the disciples at the sea of Tiberias. There were together Simon Peter, and Thomas called Didymus, and Nathanael of Cana in Galilee, and the two sons of Zebedee [James and John], and two other of his disciples."⁷⁰

At the suggestion of Peter, the disciples had gone a-fishing, their old avocation; and early in the morning Jesus appeared again to them on the beach, and directed them where to cast in the net to be successful. John was the first to exclaim: "It is the Lord." They all go ashore. They were all invited to come and partake of the morning meal which Jesus had prepared for them.

"This is now the third time that Jesus showed himself to his disciples [collectively] after that he was risen from the dead."⁷¹

Eighth Reappearance of Jesus Christ.

The only record we have in the New Testament of the eighth appearance of Jesus after his resurrection is that made by the Apostle Paul: "After that he was seen of above five hundred brethren at once, of whom the greater part remain until now; but some have fallen asleep."⁷²

Ninth Reappearance of Jesus Christ.

To "James, the Lord's brother," Jesus appeared alive after his death; but nothing is known from the record beyond *the fact*. Probably he appeared to James when he was alone, as he seems to have done to Peter. This James apparently was not one of the original twelve disciples, and is not named in the first list of the apostles.⁷³ It is possible that in the early part of Christ's ministry he was one of those "friends" who are mentioned as suspicious that Jesus was "beside himself"⁷⁴ just when he was most intently engaging in his Messianic work. Some decisive occasion must have occurred which wrought in James the conviction that Jesus was the Christ of God; for subsequently to the resurrection we find James iden-

⁶⁹ Matt. xxviii, 16, 17.

⁷⁰ John xxi, 1, 2.

⁷¹ *Ib.* xxi, 14.

⁷² 1 Cor. xv, 6.

⁷³ Matt. x, 2-5.

⁷⁴ Mark iii, 20, 21.

tified with the other apostles by common recognition. Eusebius, the first Church historian whose work has come down to us, mentions the pre-eminence which he attained among the early Christians in that he was known as "*James the Just*,"⁷⁵ who became first Bishop of Jerusalem, and presided over the Council of the Church in that city, and also wrote the epistle which bears that name. Josephus relates that the Sanhedrin condemned the "brother of Jesus who was called Christ, whose name was James, and some others, companions,"⁷⁶ to be stoned, and Eusebius particularizes how the sentence was executed. Paul mentions a special visit which he made to Jerusalem early in his own ministry, in which he spent fifteen days with Peter, and says, "But other of the apostles saw I none, save James, the Lord's brother;" that "James and Cephas and John were reputed to be pillars"⁷⁷ of the Church, all of whom gave him the right hand in recognition of his legitimate Christian apostleship. Paul, accordingly, is careful to note James in his relation to Christ's resurrection, and says: "After that he was seen of James, then of all the apostles."⁷⁸

Tenth Reappearance of Jesus Christ.

Presumably, all the apostles were present together to receive from Jesus their great commission of the apostolate, after which the Lord led them out to the Mount of the Ascension. Of Christ's appearance on this occasion Luke distinctly affirms:

"Concerning all that Jesus began, both to do and to teach, until the day in which he was received up, after that he had given commandment through the Holy Spirit unto the apostles whom he had chosen, to whom he showed himself alive after his passion by many [infallible] proofs, appearing unto them by the space of forty days, and speaking the things concerning the kingdom of God; and being assembled together with them, he charged that they should not depart from Jerusalem, but wait for the promise of the Father. . . . And when he had spoken these things, while they beheld he was taken up, and a cloud received him out of their sight."⁷⁹

⁷⁵ *Eecl. Hist.* B ii, cc. 1, 23; iv, c. 5; vii, c. 19.

⁷⁷ Gal. i, 18, 19; ii, 9; Acts xv, 13, *et seq.*

⁷⁶ *Ant.* xx, c. 9, § 1.

⁷⁸ 1 Cor. xv, 7.

⁷⁹ Acts i, 1-4, 9-11; comp. Luke xxiv, 50-52; Mark xvi, 19.

Thus far goes the record of the New Testament touching the resurrection of the Lord Jesus Christ. Obviously these ten appearances alive after his death are not exhaustive in that "he was seen of them for forty days." Nor perhaps is this the strict order of his reappearances. All that is claimed for this scheme is that it seems to be the correct one according to the scanty *data* given in these Scriptures, as the sacred writers were not careful to note the number or order of his appearances. To know them thus certainly would gratify our curiosity, but would subserve no important interest of the truth. *The fact itself*, however, is evidently secure.

δ) THE DIFFICULTIES OF THE NARRATIVES.

A revelation of the resurrection of a dead Redeemer, given by angels from heaven, is something altogether unique in itself.

§ 190. **The Unique Story.** Many of the supposed discrepancies in the accounts of the Evangelists are due to our own misapprehension of the facts related. A close and careful following of the several texts of these writers taken in their natural sense, without preconceptions or forced and arbitrary suppositions, will leave the account with but little or no embarrassment to the understanding.

That there are *seeming discrepancies* in the several accounts of the Evangelists touching the resurrection of Jesus is at least conclusive of the fact that there was certainly no collusion between the writers to fabricate the statement given. Those shrewd enough to devise a fictitious scheme on such a subject would obviously be entirely too clever to embarrass it with discrepant details. For how could designing men leave their writings in such bad form as apparently to contradict each other on the cardinal point of their fictitious Gospel? Besides, the contemporaries of these writers and their successors, for whose special advantage they wrote, had no difficulty at all in understanding the whole story of the Gospel just as it is told, with all its omissions and gaps, not-

withstanding the want of order in the chronology of the facts stated; and they have transmitted to us these writings without any attempt to explain or correct any misstatements whatever. The accounts of the resurrection, therefore, come to us, not only uncontradicted in this respect, but bearing upon their face the sanction and sanctity of the highest Christian antiquity. Notwithstanding that each writer wrote independently of the others, and at a remote distance; that each one had his own specific object in view in writing a Gospel; that every one neglected to state full details, so that occasionally the *data* are somewhat scant; yet all this does not vitiate the validity of their statement in the least, or militate against the truth of the account narrated.

Especially in the case of the resurrection of Jesus there is a profound underlying *unity* in the story itself as given in the several Gospels; a unity which would not be ignored in a court of trial where different witnesses testify, each one communicating *substantial truth, with circumstantial variety of statement*. Of course, documentary evidence is the silent testimony of the witnesses who have long been dead, and we are without the opportunities to fill the gaps in the narratives given. But this is the necessary characteristic of all documentary evidence of long standing. It is none the less historical on that account. Nevertheless, if we have in any given case insufficient evidence to form a proper judgment, our ignorance for the want of information justifies us in forming no judgment *against* the case; much less are we entitled to attribute our own mistakes to the authors, and then reject the account altogether. Griesbach in his *Probusion* says:

§ 192. The
Unity of the
Story.

“It is to be observed that the Evangelists seem to have dwelt on those particular points in which they were personally concerned. This appears to furnish a very simple key to their apparent discrepancies. John who received his first intelligence from Mary Magdalene makes her the principal person in his narrative; while Matthew, who, with the rest of the disciples, derived his information from the other

women, gives their relation [of the resurrection], and omits the appearance of Jesus to Magdalene. St. Mark gives a few additional minute particulars. But the narrative of St. Luke is altogether more vague and general. He blends together, as a later historian studious of compression, the two separate transactions; he ascribes to the women collectively that communication of the intelligence to the assembled body of the apostles which appears to have been made separately to distinct parties, and, disregarding the order of time, he after that reverts to the visit of St. Peter to the sepulcher."⁸⁰

It is proposed now to examine the several narratives to ascertain whether they are really discrepant, or whether they convey substantial agreement and truth. All the main difficulties touching the resurrection of Jesus may be reduced to five in number, namely:

- a) Differences supposed respecting *the angels* seen at Christ's tomb.
- β) Differences as to Mary's report *before or after* seeing the angels.
- γ) Differences *in time* when the women visited the sepulcher together.
- δ) Differences in *the conduct* of the women when leaving Christ's tomb.
- ε) Differences as to *the places* where Jesus appeared to his disciples.

ε) THESE DIFFERENCES RECONCILED.

A. Matthew and Mark, upon the one hand, affirm that there was *one* angel at the tomb of Jesus, but Luke and John mention *two* angels. The Evangelists enumerate the angels as one and two, as they appeared to different persons, at different times, outside or inside the empty sepulcher. The exercise of a judicious judgment is therefore called for respecting these circumstances in their proper relations, when the case will be found to be relieved of all discrepancy, without the least resort to arbitrary assumptions.*

* As illustrative of the fact that from insufficient *data* seeming discrepancies do often arise, Ebrard in his *Gospel History*, pp. 59, 60, relates the following occurrences which happened in his own experience:

"A messenger named N. was sent from Zurich to Pfaffikon on the occasion of an outbreak [of a mob] in the latter place. Accordingly, Ebrard was informed by a trustworthy person that N. was sent later in the evening with a letter to Pfaffikon. Another told him that N. was sent in the evening to Pfaffikon, but that, after going a short distance, he returned with the report that the alarm-bell had already rung at Pfaffikon. A third [party] related that two messengers had been sent on horseback to Pfaffikon; and a fourth [party] said that N. had sent two men on horseback to Pfaffikon. These seeming discrepancies vanished when Ebrard afterward learned from N. himself that he had indeed been sent, but met on the way two messengers from Pfaffikon, who reported the outbreak of the riot; that he turned back with them to Zurich, where he immediately procured horses for them, and sent them back to quiet the people of Pfaffikon. Thus we see that, once in possession of the thread of the narrative, it is an easy matter to arrange upon seemingly refractory and incompatible circumstances."

⁸⁰ Milman's *History of Christianity*, Vol. I, 356, note.

Matthew describes one angel as at first seen by the women when they were approaching the sepulcher. The angel is represented as then being *outside* the tomb:

“For the angel of the Lord descended from heaven and came and rolled back the stone and sat upon it.” “And the angel . . . said unto the women, . . . Come see the place where the Lord lay.”⁸¹

Upon the other hand, Mark says that—

“Very early in the morning, on the first day of the week, they [the women] came to the sepulcher at the rising of the sun, . . . and entering into the sepulcher, they saw a young man sitting on the right side.”⁸²

The first Gospel mentions an angel *outside* the tomb, conspicuously seated upon the great stone which had been rolled away from the entrance; and the second Gospel represents another angel *inside* the tomb, “sitting on the right side” of the sepulcher. Matthew describes the first as “the angel of the Lord descended from heaven, and came and rolled away the stone, and sat upon it;” Mark describes the one inside the sepulcher as “a young man” “clothed in a long white garment.” But now Luke describes the angels as in the form of “two men” in shining garments within the deserted tomb, and, when seen, were standing beside the women:

“And they [the women] entered in, and found not the body of the Lord Jesus; and . . . behold, two men stood by them in shining garments.”⁸³ John also speaks of “two angels in white, sitting the one at the head, and the other at the feet, where the body of Jesus had lain.”⁸⁴

Now, it is to be observed that no Evangelist, more than other witnesses in court, undertakes to include all the details of any event in his own narration. It is natural that each witness should testify first of that which impressed him most. This clears the way for the consideration of the seeming conflict between the first two and the last two Gospels, respecting (a) *the number* of the angels at the sepulcher, whether one or two; and (b) *the posture* of the angels when seen, whether standing or sitting.

⁸¹ Matt. xxviii, 2, 5, 6. ⁸² Mark xiv, 1, 2, 5. ⁸³ Luke xxiv, 2-4. ⁸⁴ John xx, 11, 12.

a) First of all we are indebted to John for discriminating the different procedures in the company of women. He draws the distinction between what Mary Magdalene did and saw apart from what the other women of Galilee did and saw.⁸⁵ They all came from the city to the sepulcher together, bringing sweet spices; and all alike were surprised to find the great stone rolled away, and that the body of Jesus was missing. But at this point the road of the women parted. Mary, without having seen an angel, ran in great haste and reported to Peter and John the opened grave and missing body; but the other women remaining saw "the angel of the Lord descended from heaven," who had "rolled back the stone from the door, and sat upon it."⁸⁶ "And entering into the sepulcher they saw [another] young man sitting on the right side, clothed in a long white garment."⁸⁷ Thus there were two angels present; one that sat on the great stone *outside* the sepulcher, and the other that sat "on the right side" *within* the sepulcher. Luke, however, does not particularize in the same manner; but he mentions that the women from Galilee "entered into [the sepulcher] and found not the body of the Lord Jesus," but that "two men stood by them in shining garments."⁸⁸ John omits altogether what the Synoptists say about the other women, and narrates what the Synoptists neglected to relate about Mary Magdalene; that she, having reported the empty tomb to Peter and John, returned to the sepulcher, and, standing outside, "stooped down and looked into the sepulcher, and seeth two angels in white, sitting the one at the head, and the other at the feet, where the body of Jesus had lain."⁸⁹ Thus the difficulty as to the *number of angels* has vanished.

β) *The posture* of the angels as seen at the sepulcher is the remaining difficulty of the case. Matthew represents an angel as having a countenance "like lightning, and his raiment

⁸⁵ Matt. xxviii, 1; Mark xvi, 1-3; Luke xxiii, 55; xxiv, 1, 2; John xx, 1.

⁸⁶ Matt. xxviii, 2, 3, 5. ⁸⁷ Mark xvi, 5. ⁸⁸ Luke xxiv, 3, 4. ⁸⁹ John xx, 11, 12.

white as snow," *seated* outside the tomb on a great stone. Mark represents an angel as *sitting* inside the sepulcher, "clothed in a long white garment." Luke represents that "two men *stood*" by the women inside the tomb "in shining garments." John represents Mary Magdalene alone, who "seeth two angels in white, *sitting*, the one at the head and the other at the feet where the body of Jesus had lain." Obviously we can not and do not have to think of angels as *inanimates*, fixed and immovable in their positions as so many statues, since the Scriptures characterize them as an order of great activities. Now, if these angels were represented as being seen by the same persons, all at once in the same moment, we clearly should have discrepant statements from our Evangelists. But just as clearly the angels were not so seen, are not so described in point of fact. Some time was requisite for the angel outside the sepulcher to deliver and impress his message upon the women to be borne to the apostles; and more time was consumed when, on the angel's invitation, the women entered into the sepulcher to inspect the situation. All this allows ample time for change in the attitude of the angels who were directing the women, quite as much as a change in place on the part of the women themselves. The angel outside the tomb did not say to the women, "*Go*," as sending them within, but, "*Come*," as leading the way, "see the place where the Lord lay."⁹⁰ The rest is as easy as it is natural. Later, when the women were within the sepulcher, they saw the angels *standing* beside them; but Mary Magdalene, returning alone to the place, saw them composedly *sitting* at the head and foot of the sepulcher. Conformably with these facts, a discrepancy is impossible.

B. The supposed difference between Luke and John as to whether Mary Magdalene reported to the apostles generally *before or after* she had seen the angels. Luke names Mary Magdalene, Joanna, and Mary the mother of James, as

⁹⁰Matt. xxviii, 6.

receiving a message from the angels for the apostles, and that they "returned from the sepulcher and told all these things unto the eleven and all the rest;"⁹¹ while John represents the Magdalene as having left the other women at the tomb, and running to report the missing body of Jesus to Peter and John. Luke omits stating this circumstance about Mary, but John particularizes it. Peter and John having heard Mary's report, they run together ahead, and Mary follows, returning to the tomb, when, for the first time, and as the first one, she sees the risen Lord. Arriving,—

"Mary stood without the sepulcher weeping, and as she wept she stooped down and looked into the sepulcher, and seeth two angels sitting . . . where the body of Jesus had lain." "And they say unto her, Woman, why weepest thou? She saith unto them, Because they have taken away my Lord, and I know not where they have laid him. When she had thus said she turned herself back, and beholdeth Jesus standing, and knew not that it was Jesus" until he called her name, "Mary." Then, but not till then, "Mary Magdalene cometh and telleth the disciples, I have seen the Lord, and how he had said these things unto her."⁹²

It is thus seen that Mary Magdalene made two different reports, on two different occasions, about two different things: the first time to Peter and John about the disturbed tomb *before* she had seen either the angels or Jesus; and also *after having seen them*, she reported again that fact unto "the eleven and to all the rest." So the supposed discrepancy disappears.

C. The difference in the *point of time* specified by the Evangelists when the women visited the Lord's sepulcher. John states that "on the first day of the week, cometh Mary Magdalene, *early while it was yet dark, unto the tomb.*"⁹³ Luke says that "on the first day of the week *at early dawn* they came unto the tomb."⁹⁴ Mark affirms that "*very early on the first day of the week they come to the tomb when the sun was risen.*"⁹⁵ Matthew states that "*as it began to dawn*

⁹¹ Luke xxiv, 9, 10.

⁹² John xx, 1, 11-18.

⁹³ *Ib.* xx, 1.

⁹⁴ Luke xxiv, 1.

⁹⁵ Mark xvi, 1, 2.

toward the first day of the week, came Mary Magdalene and the other Mary to see the sepulcher."⁹⁶ The material point of difference in these statements is that Matthew, Luke, and John substantially agree in saying that the women went to the Lord's sepulcher "as it began to dawn," "at the early dawn," "early *while it was yet dark*;" while Mark states that "they come to the tomb when *the sun was risen*." Evidently the three Evangelists who mention the dawn, contemplate the time of *starting*, while Mark contemplates the moment of *arrival*; for he expressly says, "*They come to the tomb when the sun was risen*." Some time must be allowed for so early a gathering of the women within the city while it was dark, and for the social interchange of thoughts and feelings under the intensely interesting occasion of the crucifixion just passed, and for the distribution of the spices which they themselves were to bear to the tomb, as well as for the journey itself, even if there were no short detention at the opening of the gate of the city at so early an hour. The lapse of time thus between "early dawn" and the risen sun would indeed be brief in that locality. This is but hypothesis, but it is an hypothesis which explains, and one to which the case is entitled.⁹⁷

D. The difference in the descriptions of the feelings and conduct of the women returning from the sepulcher.

Mark says: "They went out and fled from the tomb, for trembling and astonishment had come upon them; and they said nothing to any one, for they were afraid."⁹⁸ But Matthew says: "They departed quickly from the sepulcher with fear and great joy, and did run to bring the disciples word. . . . As they went to tell his disciples, behold, Jesus met them, saying, All hail! And they came and took hold of his feet, and worshiped him."⁹⁹

The discrepant passages here, as supposed, are those which represent the women as being at once filled with terror as due the angels, and yet filled with "great joy;" also that they

⁹⁶ Matt. xxviii, 1.

⁹⁷ See Starkie on the *Law of Evidence*, § 8,—(β), in this work.

⁹⁸ Mark xvi, 8.

⁹⁹ Matt. xxviii, 8, 9.

“said nothing to any one, for they were afraid,” yet “came and took hold of his feet and worshiped him,” after Jesus had hailed them on their way. If we divide the journey of the women, from the sepulcher to the disciples, into two sections, there is nothing whatever incompatible in these representations. For such in fact was the case. First, they fled the tomb and the angels in “trembling and astonishment,” and “said nothing to any one,” until they met Jesus, who hailed them. Their complete recognition of him both by sight and by his voice, revolutionized their feelings and conduct. Fright gave place to pleasure; “great joy” took the place of “trembling and astonishment.” Having become composed in his presence, he charged them with a special message, together with their own witness to the disciples of his resurrection; and from that moment they were filled with “great joy, and did run to bring his disciples word.” Thus, without the least discrepancy, the women’s conduct was as natural as it was real.

E. Finally, the differences between the accounts of Matthew and Luke as to *the place where* Jesus appeared to his disciples after he had risen. It is claimed that Matthew¹⁰⁰ represents that he manifested himself in Galilee, but Luke¹⁰¹ at or near Jerusalem where the sepulcher was.

In this objection the supposition is, that each Evangelist meant his own account to be regarded as complete in itself, and exclusive of the accounts of the other Evangelists. But this is clearly a mistake, and not according to the record of the case. For while each writer in his own *memorabilia* mentions that which occurs to him first and impresses him most, no Evangelist claims to give *all the details* about any occurrence, much less all the reappearances of the risen Savior. Now, it is evident that for some to relate those instances in which Jesus manifested himself in the neighborhood of his nativity, and others those which occurred in

¹⁰⁰ Matt. xxviii, 16.

¹⁰¹ Luke xxiv, 13-48.

Galilee, the case, in its nature, is not at all a discrepancy, but that of a supplementary narration in which discrepancy is impossible. This objection is based upon only a part of the written record, as we shall see.

Matthew relates that when the several women together in their fright fled from the tomb at Jerusalem, they met Jesus on the way. Now, this Evangelist records that Jesus himself foretold before his death, "After I am raised up, I will go before you into Galilee."¹⁰² Mark employs the identical language.¹⁰³ Matthew relates that at the sepulcher *the angel* said, "Tell his disciples that he is risen from the dead; and lo, he goeth before you into Galilee; there shall ye see him;" a circumstance which is stated more fully by Mark: "But go, tell his disciples and Peter, that he goeth before you into Galilee; there shall ye see him *as he said unto you.*"¹⁰⁴ Accordingly, Matthew continues that, "the eleven disciples went into Galilee, unto the mountain where Jesus had appointed them; and when they saw him, they worshiped him."¹⁰⁵ Mark adds that, "When Jesus was risen early on the first day of the week, he appeared first unto Mary Magdalene;" also to the two disciples, "as they walked on their way into the country" to Emmaus; also to "the eleven themselves as they sat at meat [at Jerusalem], and he upbraided them with their unbelief and hardness of heart, because they believed not them which had seen him after he was risen."¹⁰⁶ Luke is occupied in his Gospel with statements of reappearances in and near Jerusalem;¹⁰⁷ but in his Book of Acts, he records this: "To whom he also showed himself alive after his passion by many [infallible] proofs, appearing unto them by the space of forty days."¹⁰⁸ He also records Paul approvingly as saying, "God raised him from the dead, and he was seen for many days of them that came up with him from Galilee to Jerusalem, who are now witnesses unto the

¹⁰² Matt. xxvi, 32.¹⁰³ Mark xiv, 28.¹⁰⁴ Matt. xxviii, 7; Mark xvi, 7.¹⁰⁵ Matt. xxviii, 16, 17.¹⁰⁶ Mark xvi, 12, 14.¹⁰⁷ Luke xxiv, 10, 13-31, 36-40, 48, 50-52.¹⁰⁸ Acts i, 3; see also xiii, 30, 31. 265

people." So Luke also approvingly records Peter's declaration: "Him God raised up [on] the third day and gave him to be made manifest, not to all the people, but unto witnesses that were chosen before of God even to us who did eat and drink with him after he rose from the dead."¹⁰⁹ So also Paul himself, in mentioning a number of appearances of Jesus about Jerusalem, adds this also: "Then he appeared to above five hundred brethren at once, of whom the greater part remain until now."¹¹⁰ Then John relates the details of Mary Magdalene seeing Jesus alive again, his repeated appearances to the disciples at Jerusalem, and also to his disciples at the seaside in Galilee. "This is now the third time that Jesus was manifested to his disciples [collectively] after that he was risen from the dead."¹¹¹ It is thus evident that from the record, on the testimony of all the sacred writers, Jesus was seen after his resurrection, *both* in Judæa and Galilee, and no discrepancy appears.

III. CONFIRMATIONS BY ENEMIES OF CHRISTIANITY.

The special value of this testimony consists in the fact that as early as the middle of the second century when Celsus in literature assailed Christianity, he verifies the verdict of Christendom, and dreads the conviction of the heathen world *respecting the resurrection of Jesus from the dead*. His energetic opposition to the belief admits the prior and current historical claim of Christ's rising. For while he sometimes denies for himself that event, he admits that something certainly did occur which suddenly and powerfully affected both friends and foes of the new religion. That something was rapidly and deeply moving whole communities toward Christianity with a conviction that was as permanent as it was revolutionary in character religiously. It required explanation;

§193. Testi-
mony of
Celsus.

¹⁰⁹ Acts x, 40, 41.

¹¹⁰ 1 Cor. xv, 4-6; comp. Matt. xxviii, 16, 17; Mark xiv, 28.

¹¹¹ John xx, 14, 17, 19-22, 24-26; xxi, 1, 2-14.

but an explanation Celsus was never able to give; so he weakly resorts to ridicule in the place of reasoning. It will, however, be specially noted that he never in any instance ascribes Christ's resurrection to a mythical origin, or to some vague legend as having a modicum of truth with a large part of fiction. Upon the contrary, he repeatedly reminds his Christian readers, and accentuates the fact, that for his information on Christian beliefs he relies exclusively on the sacred books of the Christians which he had in his possession—books which he himself affirms were written by Christ's disciples. Accordingly, Celsus accepts the Gospels as those writings relied upon by Christians in distinction from all other writings which were apocryphal which arose in the middle of the second century. He says:

“By what, then, were you induced [to become Christians]? Was it because he foretold that after his death he would rise again?”¹¹² “But this is the question, Whether any one who was really dead ever rose again with a veritable body?”¹¹³ “*He rose after his death, and exhibited the marks of his punishment, and showed how his hands had been pierced by nails;*” and “while alive, he was no assistance to himself, but that when he was dead, he rose again and showed the marks of his punishment, and how his hands were pierced with nails.”¹¹⁴

Origen, replying to Celsus, quotes him as saying:

“We ridicule those who worship Jupiter because his tomb is pointed out in the island of Crete; and yet we worship him who rose from the tomb;”¹¹⁵ “He assails us who acknowledge that our Jesus had been buried indeed, but who maintain that he has been raised from the tomb; a statement which the Cretans have not yet made regarding Jupiter.”¹¹⁶

The evidential value of Celsus's testimony is to be found directly in the disturbing reason which induced the people to become Christians, but which he absolutely fails to answer as his own question. He admits that *Jesus was dead* as not to be questioned; and he seems to cite with approval the Christian belief when he says, “He rose after his death and ex-

¹¹² *Origen contra Celsum*, ii, 54.

¹¹³ *Ib.* ii, 57.

¹¹⁴ *Ib.* ii, 59; ii, 55.

¹¹⁵ *Ib.* iii, 43, τὸν ἀπὸ τοῦ τάφου.

¹¹⁶ *Ib.* iii, 43.

hibited the marks of his punishment, and showed how his hands had been pierced with nails," affirming that from the beginning the Christians did "worship him who rose from the tomb." This is the assertion of the capital fact which is its own explanation. If Jesus had not risen from the dead as he himself had foretold, he would never have been worshiped by mankind, nor would Christianity ever have obtained a foothold among the nations. It is precisely that fact that has given the Christian religion such power over men. That alone absolutely answers Celsus's questions; not that Jesus *foretold* his own resurrection, but that, having foretold it, it became a real and undeniable fact to those who saw him after that he was risen. Nothing else can account for the origin of Christianity; and nothing else is required for the sufficient explanation.

As exhibiting how the Jews dreaded the circulation of the report that Jesus whom they had crucified, had risen,¹¹⁷ and §194. The Tes- to what extremes they had recourse in order to
 timony of avoid and evade the powerful influence of the
 Toledoth Jeshu. fact, it may be well to insert the testimony of
 this rabbinical work on this subject. It says:

"After the death of Jesus, his body was dragged ignominiously through the streets of Jerusalem; and when distant disciples heard the report of their Master's death and resurrection, they hastened to send a deputation to the city to investigate the facts; and upon their arrival the Jewish rulers showed them the [pretended] Master's corpse, after which the deputation retired and returned home, *reporting that he was risen from the dead!*"¹¹⁸

If this story is not absolutely a fiction throughout, it is barely possible that the Jews sought to impose upon the deputation by showing them the dead body of some man as a proof that Jesus was not indeed risen and alive again; but the deputation at once detecting the attempted cheat, and having

¹¹⁷ Matt. xxvii, 64; comp. Acts iv, 14-17, and v, 28.

¹¹⁸ Comp. note at end of § 183, and Dr. Whately's Annotation on Paley's *Evidences*, Part II, c. 8, p. 302, Amer. ed.

the true account confirmed in Jerusalem, they returned and reported the case as it really was to their people.

Rabbi Moses Haddarshan, alluding to Messiah as referred to by the prophet Hosea, says: "After two days he [Messiah] will revive us; he will revive us in the days of the consolation to come." *"The Messiah . . . shall die and rise again; and the dead shall be raised."*¹¹⁹

§ 195. Testimony of the Talmud.

It was the remarkable saying of Rabbi Judah Hakkodesh, "*After three days the soul of the Messiah shall return to its body, and he shall go out of that [sepulcher of] stone in which he shall be buried.*"¹²⁰

In his testimony of Jesus, Josephus affirms that "*He appeared to them alive again on the third day, as the divine prophets had foretold these and ten thousand other wonderful things concerning him.*"¹²¹

§ 196. Testimony of Josephus.

IV. RECONFIRMATIONS BY FRIENDS OF CHRISTIANITY.

The witness of the immediate disciples and successors of the apostles is the connecting link in the history of this fundamental fact and doctrine of the Christian faith. The testimony of the Apostolic Fathers serves not only to prove the anterior origin of the faith as claimed, but also serves to prove the identity of that fact and faith with that now embraced and maintained in the Christian Church.

§ 197. Testimony of the Apostolic Fathers.

1. Barnabas (A. D. 70-79): "Having brought about the resurrection he will himself exercise judgment." "Wherefore also we keep the eighth day for rejoicing, *in which also Jesus rose from the dead.*"¹²²

2. Clement of Rome (A. D. 95): "How the Master continually showeth unto us the resurrection. . . . Wherefore he made the Lord Jesus Christ the firstfruits when he raised him from the dead. Day and night, dearly beloved, show unto us the resurrection."¹²³

¹¹⁹ On Gen. xxii, 4, Ber. Rab. and Targum, see Schöttgen, *Lectiones Rabbinicæ*, i, ii, pp. 557, 558, 572; cf. Matt. xxvii, 51-53.

¹²⁰ Cited by Dr. Adam Clarke, *Commentary on Matt. xxviii, 7*, last ed.

¹²¹ Josephus, *Antiquities*, B. 18, c. 3, § 3. See *Excursus A*, of this work.

¹²² Barn. *Epistle*, cc. 5, 15. ¹²³ Clem. *Epis.* c. 24.

3. Ignatius (A. D. 107): "Ignatius . . . rejoiceth in the passion of our Lord, and in his resurrection without wavering."¹²⁴ "Jesus Christ who was of the race of David, who was the son of Mary, . . . persecuted under Pontius Pilate, was truly crucified and died in the sight of those in heaven, and those on earth, and those under the earth; who moreover *was truly raised from the dead, his Heavenly Father having raised him*, who in like fashion will raise us also who believe in him."¹²⁵ "My chart is Jesus Christ, . . . his death and his resurrection, and faith through him." "The Gospel hath a singular pre-eminence in the advent of the Savior, even our Lord Jesus Christ, and his passion and resurrection."¹²⁶

4. Polycarp (A. D. 155): "Paul himself and the rest of the apostles . . . loved . . . Him who died for our sakes, and *was raised by God for us*." "Our Lord Jesus Christ, who endured to face even death for our sins, *whom God raised*, having loosed the pangs of Hades." "And may He grant unto you a lot and portion among the saints . . . who shall believe on our Lord and God Jesus Christ, *and his Father that raised him from the dead*."¹²⁷

The earliest defenders of Christianity, before the local or the imperial government, gave expression to that which completes the proof that the Church was founded upon the imperishable fact of Christ's resurrection from the dead. They constantly affirmed and tenaciously maintained "the faith once delivered to the saints." Their witness gives unity and continuity to the historical belief in the resurrection. No historian is supposed to have witnessed the events which he records; but wisely searches for just such evidence as is furnished by the Christian Apologists on this subject. Their testimony may be taken in chronological order.

§ 198. Testimony of the Christian Apologists.

1. Aristides (A. D. 123-126): "He was pierced by the Jews, and he died and was buried; and they say that *after three days he rose*."¹²⁸

2. Tertullian (A. D. 200): "Then when his body was taken down from the cross and placed in a sepulcher, the Jews in their eager watchfulness surrounded it with a large military guard, lest, as he had predicted his resurrection from the dead on the third day, his disciples might remove by stealth his body, and deceive even the incredulous. But lo! on the third day there was a shock of earthquake, and the seal which sealed [the great stone of] the sepulcher [was broken, and the

¹²⁴ Ignat. *Introd. Epis. to Phil'a.*

¹²⁵ *Epis. to Trall's*, c. 9.

¹²⁶ *Epis. to Phil'a*, cc. 8, 9.

¹²⁷ Poly. *Epistle*, cc, 9. 1, 12.

¹²⁸ Aris. *Apology*.

stone] was rolled away, and the guard fled off in terror without a single disciple near; the grave was found empty of all but the clothes of the buried One."¹²⁹

3. Origen (A. D. 248): "For who is ignorant of the statement that Jesus was born of a virgin, and that he was crucified, *and that his resurrection is an article of faith among [the] many.*" "And yet the mystery of the resurrection, not being understood, is made a subject of ridicule among unbelievers."¹³⁰

Paul's witness on the resurrection of Jesus is invaluable on two special accounts: because of his prior hostility to Christianity, and because that now no living skeptic denies the authenticity and credibility of Paul's first four Epistles. The fiercest adversary became the greatest advocate of the Christian religion. What wrought such revolution in the conviction of Saul of Tarsus? He alone can tell the story, and no human being was ever willing to die for a lie, he knowing it to be such. When upon a mission of persecution, "yet breathing out threatenings and slaughter against the disciples of the Lord," he was smitten to the earth by an unseen power; and from the dust he looked up and talked with the risen and ascended Christ in heaven.¹³¹ Becoming converted in his faith, he remained a changed man in his life. His genius and learning, his culture and spirituality, thenceforth gave him a power over men never realized except by and from the "Man of Nazareth." No apostle, nor all the apostles together, labored so successfully for the development of the Christian doctrine as he. His personal work and influence, so far from having diminished, have extended down the centuries, and are realized more than ever among the great and greatest nations of the earth, and are felt most in the foremost civilizations which his teachings have created. Dr. Philip Schaff observes:

§ 199. Testimony of the Apostle Paul.

"The late Dr. Keim [says]: 'The whole character of Paul, his sharp understanding, which was not weakened by his enthusiasm; the careful, cautious, measured, simple form of statement; *above all, the favorable total impression of his narrative, and the mighty echo of it in the unanimous,*

¹²⁹Tertull. *Apol.* c. 21. ¹³⁰Origen *contra Celsum*, 1, c. 7. ¹³¹Acts, ix, xxii, xxvi.

uncontradicted faith of primitive Christendom, must not be overlooked.' Dr. Baur, the master-spirit of skeptical criticism, and founder of the Tübingen School, felt constrained, shortly before his death, . . . to say, that in 'the sudden transformation of Paul from the most violent adversary of Christianity into its most determined herald,' he could see 'nothing short of a miracle.' 'This miracle appears all the greater when we remember that, in the revulsion of his consciousness, he broke through the barriers of Judaism, and rose out of its particularism into the universalism of Christianity.'¹³²

In Paul's *ministry* at Athens he "preached unto them *Jesus and the resurrection.*" . . . "Wherefore he hath given assurance unto all men, in that he hath raised him from the dead."¹³³ In the apostle's *imprisonment* at Cæsarea-on-the-Sea, Festus, the noble procurator, explained to King Agrippa II why Paul was a prisoner in his custody, saying that the Jews had brought accusations "against him of their own superstition, and of one *Jesus whom Paul affirmed to be alive.*"¹³⁴

In his Letters, Paul taught the same great fact and doctrine of Christ's resurrection. Dedicating his Epistle to the Romans to this imperishable principle, he writes with great power:

"Concerning his Son, who was born of the seed of David, according to the flesh, who was declared to be THE SON OF GOD with power, according to the Spirit of holiness *by the resurrection from the dead, even Jesus Christ our Lord.* . . . Knowing that Christ, being raised from the dead, dieth no more." "If thou wilt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and wilt believe in thy heart that *God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved.*" "Unto whom it shall be reckoned who believe on him that raised up *Jesus our Lord from the dead, who was delivered for our offenses, and was raised for our justification.*" "But if the Spirit of him that raised up *Jesus from the dead dwell in you, he that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies, by his Spirit that dwelleth in you.*"

In his Epistle to the Galatians, Paul speaks of himself in respect to his apostolate as being "an apostle, not of men, neither by man, but by Jesus Christ and God the Father, *who raised him from the dead.*"¹³⁵

¹³² *Hist. Christ. Church*, Vol. I, p. 315. ¹³³ Acts xvii, 18, 31. ¹³⁴ Acts xxv, 14, 19.

¹³⁵ Rom. i. 3, 4; iv, 23-25; vi, 8-10; viii, 11; x, 9; comp. 1 Thess. iv, 13-17; Acts xxiv, 14, etc. ¹³⁶ Gal. i, 1.

In his Epistle to the Corinthians, Paul iterates and accentuates the fact of the doctrine of Christ's resurrection with considerable enlargement. He says:

"I delivered unto you, first of all, that which I also received, how that Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures; and that he was buried, *and that he rose again the third day*, according to the Scriptures; and that he was seen of Cephas, then of the Twelve; after that he was seen of above five hundred brethren at once, of whom the greater part remain unto this day. . . . After that he was seen of James, then of all the apostles; and last of all was he seen of me also."¹³⁶

Such was the teaching of the Apostle Paul in indoctrinating the several Churches on the fundamental truths of Christianity.

V. MONUMENTAL EVIDENCE OF HIS RESURRECTION.

As the sacrament of the Lord's Supper has ever been the solemn *Memorial of Christ's death*, § 200. Monuments of the Resurrection. so there now exist two *Monuments of his resurrection*. These are respectively designated *The Christian Church* and *The Christian Sabbath*.

a) The *existence of the Church of Jesus Christ* is in itself an enduring monument of his resurrection. It must be so in the very nature of the case. Clearly, if there had been no resurrection, there could be no Church founded upon it. But the Church *does exist*, and *has* existed in unbroken continuity from the times of the apostles until now. It has ever been standing before the Ages, a visible institution, living an historical life through all these Christian centuries since. It began to be at a definite date; it has continued to be, despite the oppositions which have confronted it and the distresses and cruelties imposed upon it from Jewish and Roman persecutions. It lives to-day, a great Society abroad in the world, identified with the foremost nations of the earth, extending its benign influence to all pagan lands, and numbering in its organization hundreds of millions of the best peoples among mankind.

¹³⁶ 1 Cor. xv, 3-8.

There was a brief period intervening the crucifixion and the organization of Christianity into a Church, which should not be overlooked. It was a time conspicuous for its wrecked hopes, its demoralized faith, and its outcry of despair and anguish, on the part of the broken-hearted apostles. In the death of the crucified Christ everything was lost to them, as they saw it. Every source of hope was extinguished. It was the death of all their Messianic conceptions of Christ's kingdom and reign. In the morning of the third day, some first messengers came hurriedly to tell them that Jesus was alive again, that he had been seen, and that he had risen from his tomb. But the apostles could not heed their word. To them it seemed that their report was a most improbable vagary, which they must have imagined. It was rejected in absolute negation. As previously, they only mourned and wept, and their words seemed to them as idle tales, and they believed them not. Unto some of them at least Jesus soon appeared, "and upbraided them with their unbelief and hardness of heart, because they believed not them which had seen him after he was risen." Meantime, some of them had abandoned the cause, and returned to their old occupation—to their nets and fishing-boats in the sea of Galilee. Now we are come upon their crucial moments. When the third day was opening, a stupendous event occurred suddenly, which took the apostles by surprise. Its effect was to counteract their feelings of utter despair, to revolutionize all their prior convictions of the Messianic situation, and to inspire them every one with a new faith and a marvelous courage. There was but the one occurrence, but that wrought a complete revolution and conversion of the apostles. *It was the power of a new fact; it was the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead.* Nothing less could have given them the new moral uplift. Brought now into a better understanding of his Messianic kingship as being not monarchical, but spiritual, their faith began to be reconstructed intelligently, and it abides in the Church to this day. With an

astounding energy and courage the apostles began to publish openly, before friends and foes alike, the fact of the risen Christ; and on this fact they founded the faith and the existence of Christianity. Henceforth their watchword down through all the succeeding ages has been, The Crucified and Risen Lord. On that one truth the very existence and life of the Church repose. The Church, accordingly, is a living and perpetuating monument of Christ's resurrection.

β) Another monument is the Christian Sabbath. The transfer from the seventh to the first day of the week for its observance is not, and never was, claimed on the ground of a *specific command*. *But the New Testament is by no means a book of mere specific commands*. It is rather the embodiment of great *principles* looking to great *spiritual ends*, for the advantage of *man's spiritual life*. "The Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath; therefore the Son of man is Lord also of the Sabbath." It would indeed be a fallacy in reasoning to suppose that a specific command was indispensable for the radical and revolutionary change from Judaism to Christianity; from the system of sacrifices and ceremonies of the ancient Jews to the faith and institutions of the Christian Church. It is precisely so in the change from the Jewish to the Christian Sabbath, of which each was distinctively an integral and representative part of its own religious system. The Sabbaths went and came with their respective systems. In the absence of any *express requirement* from Christ, either to abolish or continue the Jewish national Sabbath, the change made was as radical and absolute as the change in the system to which it belonged.

This legitimates the inquiry for the *principle* and the *authority* involved in the change of the Sabbath days. The principle is discoverable in the distinctive *object* of the Sabbath observed, and the *authority* for the change in the *example and practice* of the authorized apostles themselves. Jesus was with his disciples forty days, "speaking of the things pertaining to

the kingdom of God" after his rising. Much of those instructions and authorizations remains *unwritten* in the Gospels; but all, as we would naturally expect, was wrought into the practice of the early Church, when the apostles laid its foundations, and reconstructed its institutions and monuments, "built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone." Now, as to the objects had in view, the Jewish Sabbath was set apart to be commemorative of God's creation, as a *finished work*; and the Christian Sabbath was set apart as commemorative of Christ's *finished redemption*, "even the redemption of your body." Hence it has always been religiously observed by acts of worship and service in celebration of Christ's resurrection. By so much as our redemption as God's loving act transcends the work of creation of the world, by so much is the Christian Sabbath superior and supreme touching man's *spiritual* interests. This should be constantly kept in sight as a determining factor in the change effected in the day. So much as to the objects contemplated respecting the two Sabbaths and their religious observance.

In regard to the *practice* of the primitive Church in inaugurating the Christian Sabbath with its new and special object for observance, there was no specific command for the *continuance* of the Jewish Sabbath while yet *the whole Jewish system was absolutely abolished*. To that system it distinctively belonged, in which it was a most conspicuous institution. For a period the apostles, all being Jewish Christians, naturally felt at liberty to employ the old sacrificial observances in their worship in the temple, in which they had been religiously educated and developed; but the time drew near when Judaism and Christianity separated. On the Jewish Sabbath day, the tenth day of August, in A. D. 70, the ancient temple itself was burned down by the Romans, the fires of sacrifice upon its altars were forever extinguished, and the whole Jewish system

was absolutely abolished and abandoned. The nation was expatriated and dispersed, and in no land since has there been erected a Jewish altar for sacrificial offering to God. The practice of the apostles, commissioned especially as they were by Christ for their work, must be regarded as the sufficient authority for the Sabbatic change in the day. For it must be obvious that, however they may have acted without the *written requirement* from Christ, they could not have acted without his *unwritten authority*. It would indeed be a violent presumption to assume that the first thing the apostles did in their new commission was to discard the old Sabbath when it was meant that it should be preserved and perpetuated, and proceed to institute and inaugurate a new Sabbath without authority. And if the claim were made that the old Sabbath was incorporated in the Decalogue, and especially emphasized as no other command was, "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy," the sufficient reply is, that the requirement was to remember the *Sabbath day*, but *not to remember the seventh day*. And this is done in the observance of the Christian Sabbath; for all that was sacred and obligatory in the old was reverently transferred and perpetuated to the new Sabbath. In the original Sabbath room was left for such transfer, in that, in every one of the six days mentioned, there was a limitation by the evening and the morning; but the seventh or the Sabbath was left without such limitation.¹³⁷ It was therefore open and free for the apostles, in organizing the Christian Church in separation from the Jewish Church, to institute the new day appropriate to the new faith, in the new Church, for the new era in human history.

What, then, does the practice of the apostles and their successors prove and illustrate touching the change from the seventh to the first day of the week?

¹³⁷ Compare Gen. 1, 31, and 11, 2, 3.

a. The apostles themselves, in recognition of the Christian Sabbath day, very distinctively and significantly called it "*The Lord's Day*," and they restricted its religious observance to "*the first day of the week.*"¹³⁸

b. In the newly found document known as the *Teaching of the Apostles* (dating about A. D. 70), the Christian Sabbath is emphasized as "*the Lord's own day.*" It reads: "Gather yourselves together and break bread and give thanks."

c. *The Apostolic Fathers*, who were personally taught by the apostles in the observances of the Christian doctrine and faith, have in turn recorded their teachings for the Church thus:

Barnabas (A. D. 70) says:

"Your present Sabbaths are not acceptable to me. . . . [God says] I will make a [new] beginning of the eighth day . . . wherefore we keep the Lord's day with joyfulness; the day on which Jesus rose from the dead." ¹³⁹

Ignatius (A. D. 107) says:

"If, then, those who walked in the ancient practices attain unto newness of hope, no longer observing Sabbaths, but fashioning their lives after the Lord's day, on which our Life also arose through him, . . . that we may be found disciples of Jesus Christ, our only Teacher."¹⁴⁰

d. Justin Martyr, the Apologist (135-145), says:

"Sunday is a day on which we all hold our common assembly, because it is the first day of the week on which God, having wrought a change in the darkness and matter, made the world; and Jesus Christ our Savior on the day he rose from the dead. . . . And on the day called Sunday all who live in cities or in the country gather in one place and the Memoirs [*i. e.*, the Gospels] of the apostles, or the writings of the prophets, are read as long as time permits."¹⁴¹

e. Irenæus, Bishop of Lyons (178) wrote: "The mystery of the Lord's resurrection may not be celebrated on any other day than the Lord's Day."¹⁴²

¹³⁸ See Rev. 1, 10; Acts xx, 7; 1 Cor. xvi, 2; John xx, 19, 26.

¹³⁹ *Epis.* c. 15. ¹⁴⁰ *Epis. to Mag.* 9. ¹⁴¹ *First Apol.* c. 67.

¹⁴² See McClintock and Strong's *Cyclop.* v, 507.

f. Cyprian, Bishop of Carthage (200–258), mentions “the Lord’s Day” as both “the first and the eighth day.”¹⁴³

Now, as has been noted elsewhere, accounting that the Christian era began, according to corrected chronology, B. C. 4, and that the crucifixion occurred about twenty-nine years afterward, reckoning on to the opening of the year 1900, the Christian Sabbath will have been celebrated continuously throughout Christendom no less than 97,292 times *as an act and observance monumental of the resurrection of Christ*.*

VI. MODERN THEORIES OF THE RESURRECTION.

Skeptical critics, feeling the power of the fact in the Christian system, have sought to explain the occurrence of the resurrection of Jesus, in the one case, by the theory of an *abnormal condition of Christ’s body*; in another, by the *abnormal condition of the apostles’ minds*. Both are baseless suppositions illustrative of an evasion of the real fact, and neither offers a substantial reason to support the position assumed. If one theory would prove the proposition, the other would thereby be disproved as the theory; but both theories assume what neither proves nor can prove, by simply begging the question, which is so much more convenient for the advocates.

When Ferdinand Christian Baur openly affirmed that the *nature* of Christ’s resurrection was *not* a proper subject for *historical investigation*, his position was severely criticised by Strauss as being an evasion of the main point at issue between Christianity and all negative criticism. Nevertheless, in that particular, Baur was clearly right. For obviously the nature of an event is one thing, and its historical occurrence as a fact is another. If a miracle was something to be explained on natural principles, then the *nature of the resurrection* would be that which

* For a development of the Evidence and Argument respecting the Christian Sabbath, see §§ 105–120.

¹⁴³ McClintock and Strong’s *Cyclop.* v, 507.

§ 201 F. C. Baur
and the
Resurrection.

belongs to *philosophy*, and not to the department of *historicity*. Of course, it is the legitimate function of Christian evidence to traverse the past fact of the resurrection of Jesus as a subject of historical inquiry, the same as any other event of the past, without engaging to *explain the miracle-power* by which it was brought to pass.

The *kind* of evidence which one has a right to expect on an historical question of antiquity should be carefully noted in the outset. No event outside of science can be treated with mathematical proof. The resurrection is not an event to which mathematics applies. Being a miraculous occurrence its nature can not be explained by reason. For, as Schelling has remarked, "Nothing is more doleful than the occupation of all rationalists who strive to make that rational which declares itself above reason." It does not address itself to any of the physical senses in the present time. It is not something that can be known by our mental *intuitions*, because it is not a subject to be contemplated by *the common, the necessary, and spontaneous perceptions of mankind*, which are the characteristics of our intuitions. It claims to be an *historical truth*, and is to be investigated as such exclusively, as in the case of any other event of the past. An occurrence which by its own force has wrought such deep and enduring conviction in the minds of men for a period of nearly twenty centuries; which all the scorn and persecution of enemies could not suppress; which has changed the course of history on earth, is an occurrence of paramount importance in history, and is to be accounted for historically on the principle of reason and common sense. But the investigation must be conducted in the interests of truth, not in the interests of prepossessions or *à priori* bias of mind, or the inquiry will necessarily be onesided and nugatory. The two principal theories of the negative school which are offered in lieu of the resurrection of Christ, will now command attention.

§ 202. The
Evidence
Applicable.

I. THE THEORY OF THE SWOON.

Paulus of Heidelberg is prominent among those who have advocated this hypothesis. In substance it holds to the view that Jesus did not actually *die* upon the cross, as § 203. Theory of Paulus. all the Gospels represent, but that, through his intense sufferings so prolonged, he lost consciousness and fell into a *swoon*, which lasted three days, when animation returned—possibly by reason of the sweet spices administered, which restored the body to its normal condition. It is further maintained that the body of Jesus was laid in the rock-hewn cave, but upon recovering consciousness, in some unknown way, he escaped death and the guard, and went unaided to his friends and their tender ministries. He lingered awhile in obscurity, and finally died a natural death, and was buried privately by friends.

In all this, Paulus believed that *something did happen* according to the Gospels, but discredits the Gospel account because of this stupendous miracle! It must be admitted that the hypothesis is an admirable piece of *imagination*, although utterly destitute of historical proof. Its chief fallacy lies in the fact that it assumes to be true that which remains to be proved. Moreover, the theory encounters insuperable difficulties. It fails to account for all the phenomena involved in the case. It ignores the statement of Matthew that *Pilate was amazed that Jesus had died so soon*, and the procurator would not surrender his body even to Joseph of Arimathea, a Sanhedrist, without first dispatching his own military officer of the day to ascertain the fact of his death, and report the same to himself in person. It ignores the statement of Mark, that when Pilate received the centurion's confirmation that *Jesus was dead, he granted "the dead body"** to Joseph for interment. It fails to explain how a man who had endured for six hours the mortal agonies on the cross, spiked through the hands and

* πτῶμα, expressly a dead body, a *corpse*.

feet, *his heart pierced through* by the soldier's spear, with the necessary loss of blood and vitality, *would swoon away rather than die, then recover consciousness, and, when weak and helpless and alone, could break the procurator's seal and roll back the great stone at the door of the sepulcher which imprisoned him, and in the presence of an armed military guard, especially appointed to keep the body in its custody, escape to his friends unseen.* It fails to account for that perfect and profound conviction, not transient but enduring, that his followers experienced when they were suddenly lifted out of the depths of despondency and despair, and filled with a deathless hope, and began at once to proclaim the risen Jesus, right at Jerusalem where he had just been crucified, in the courts of the temple to the people, and in the hall of the rulers before the Sanhedrists of the nation.

The notion of a swoon is not only incompatible with the only authentic accounts given, but is without any authority whatever from any ancient history. It fails completely to account for the founding and continuance of the Christian Church, if based upon a known falsehood; for if Jesus was then and afterwards in the private keeping of his friends, they must have known that the claim of a resurrection was a false pretense, and his claim to the Messiaship a base imposture. But here develops a change of base; *the theory of a swoon becomes displaced by that of fraud.*

Strauss voices the view of other skeptics on this point. He says:

“It is impossible that a being who had stolen half dead out of the sepulcher, who crept about weak, wanting medical treatment, who required bandaging, strengthening, and nursing, and who at last yielded to his sufferings, could have given to the disciples the impression that he was a Conqueror over death and the grave, the Prince of Life—an impression which lay at the basis of their future ministry. Such a resuscitation could only have weakened the impression which he had made upon them in their life and death; but could by no possibility have changed their sorrow into enthusiasm, have elevated their rever-

ence into worship.”¹⁴⁴ “The historian must acknowledge that the disciples firmly believed that Jesus was risen.” And “the fact that the Apostle Paul heard from the mouth of Peter, of James, and of others besides, that Jesus had appeared to them; and that they all, and also the five hundred, were absolutely convinced that they had seen Jesus living after he had died, is one which we will not call in question.”¹⁴⁵

Baur insists that—

“History must hold to the assertion that the faith of the disciples in the resurrection of Jesus Christ was a fact, and indisputable. It is on this faith only that Christianity found a ground solid enough to erect upon it the superstructure of its whole historic development.” “*Nothing but the miracle of the resurrection could disperse the doubts which threatened to drive faith into the eternal night of death. For the faith of the disciples of Jesus became the most solid and most irrefutable certainty.*”¹⁴⁶

Dr. Ewald speaks the final word :

“Nothing is historically more certain than that Christ rose from the dead, and appeared to his own; and that this their vision was the beginning of a new, higher faith, and all their Christian labors.”¹⁴⁷

It must be admitted that they who think that the Christian faith is too credulous, should be careful not to tax too severely our credulity in *their theories*, instead of our belief. It is too much to ask us to believe that which exists only in their own imagination to be historical, being unsupported by sound reason or foundation in fact. Worse than all, it is an explanation which fails to explain.

II. THE THEORY OF HALLUCINATION.

This hypothesis is more commonly known as “*The Vision Theory*,” and has found a wider acceptance by those of the skeptical school than the theory of the swoon. It postulates that the reappearances of Jesus alive after his death were merely *subjective* to the minds of his friends, but were without any *objective* reality in fact. In other words, it was all merely an imaginary

§204. The
Prevailing
Theory.

¹⁴⁴ *New Life of Jesus* 1, 412.

¹⁴⁵ *Leben Jesu*, 1864, p. 289.

¹⁴⁶ *First Three Centuries*, Vol. I, 39-42.

¹⁴⁷ *Hist. of Apostolic Age*, Vol. VI, 52, 69, *et seq.*

illusion, an hallucination of the mind due to the intensely morbid condition of the friends of Jesus in their anguish after his crucifixion, when their sensitive souls were thrilled with the expectancy of seeing him alive again. Rénan refers the whole story of his being seen alive again to the authority of Mary Magdalene, who, with the glow of a fictionist exclaims: "Divine power of love! Sacred moments when the passion of a woman under hallucination gives the world a God restored from the dead!" This view of the Magdalene was first hinted by Celsus* in the second century; but it was afterward revived and modified by the philosophical Jew named Spinoza; and more recently it was developed by Strauss, Rénan, and in England, by the author of the work entitled *Supernatural Religion*. Strauss refers the origin of the account of the resurrection to the vision of the apostles in the region of Galilee, but Rénan refers it to Mary Magdalene at the tomb of Jesus at Jerusalem.

In order to postulate the theory of self-delusion, *it is absolutely necessary to discredit the evidence of the senses, with all*

§ 205. The *the conclusions which they legitimate in our con-*
Theory and its *sciousness*. For the witnesses of his resurrection
Criticism.

do solemnly affirm that Jesus Christ *did rise from the dead*: "Whereof we are all witnesses." They affirm this upon the evidence of the three senses—sight, hearing, and touch—the very senses by which we cognize personality and the occurrence of events everywhere in the common course of life. In courts of law the senses of the witnesses are regarded as being as absolutely reliable as are our own. It is upon the evidence of what the witnesses have seen and heard directly in the case involved, and therefore know, that criminals have been condemned to the dungeon and the scaffold in all the centuries of the civilizations. If one should dare to distrust the evidences of his own senses, he would fur-

*Celsus, speaking of Christ exhibiting his wounds, says: "Who beheld this? A half-frantic woman as you state" (in the Gospels). (*Origen contra Celsum*, ii, 59.)

nish the best evidence of his inanity or insanity. If we have the absolute right to claim the evidence of our sense-intuitions for ourselves, so have others the absolute right to claim it for themselves. We can not deny their claim. Is it not a violent presumption which attempts to set aside, without the slightest proof of abnormal mind, the conscious convictions of more than five hundred sensible witnesses to any given fact? Would this assumption and presumption be countenanced for one moment in any civil court? Would this postulate be attempted in any other case than that of Christ's rising, or even in that, but with a view of escaping *the miracle of the resurrection, and all that that necessitates?* Wisely does Dr. Van Oosterzee remark:

“ We feel how boundless is the caprice which would remove the glorious solution from the history of the life of Jesus, and transfer it henceforth to the history of the apostles and their self-deception!”¹⁴⁸

Upon the other hand, this hypothesis is itself beset with difficulties insuperable. Its character is such that it can command credence with only that class of persons who are superstitious enough to believe in seeing ghosts. This certainly demands a stretch of credulity too exorbitant to find acceptance on the part of persons of intelligence and good sense. The hypothesis is put at unqualified disadvantage when offered as a substitute for the faith which we repose in the supreme fact of a risen Redeemer. Does it not border on insane credulity to believe that “more than five hundred” persons in the mountains of Galilee were suddenly seized with a *mania*, all at the same time, in thinking that they saw the same specter; that the delusion began at a distinct date, continued just forty days, and then ceased forever as suddenly as it began—an hypothesis which is without a parallel in all the superstitious stories of ghost-seeing? Moreover, we are asked to believe that this mental hallucination extended itself so as to com-

¹⁴⁸ *Dogmatics*, ii, 569.

mand the credence of multitudes of others; that the Christian Church, with all its code of moral and spiritual requirements, and all its experience in spiritual development among the millions of mankind through nearly two thousand years since—a Church composed of the wisest and best portions of all the civilizations—is founded on the merest delusion! Nor is it to be rationally believed that at the outset the Jews, who in their fierce instigation crucified Jesus of Nazareth, should become converted to the faith by the thousand within a few days,¹⁴⁹ and a large company of the priests become deluded into an “obedience to the faith.”¹⁵⁰

The hypothesis fails at the initial point of Christianity, as it fails to account for the existence and continuance of the Christian Church. On the historical side of this question, how does the theory of vision explain *what became of the body of Jesus?* The empty sepulcher demands an explanation on the part of those who have ignored it in their theory. That the body of Jesus was duly sepulchered in the tomb of Joseph of Arimathea is a matter of history, and stands undisputed. How did it escape the vigilance of the military guard, and what became of it after it passed from their custody? The advocates of this theory must account for all the phenomena involved in the case. Either the body of Jesus remained in the tomb, or it was removed by human hands, or it arose from the dead. If it remained, why did not the Jewish Sanhedrists produce it, and boldly refute the bolder claim of the apostles when they were arraigned before the Council and unhesitatingly affirmed, “The God of our fathers raised up Jesus whom ye crucified. . . . Him hath God exalted with his own right hand to be a Prince and Savior?”¹⁵¹ If the body was removed by friends, the apostles, in preaching his rising as a fundamental fact to the Christian religion, were guilty of the basest duplicity and imposture, and they knew it to be so. But to maintain this is to confess that the theory of the delu-

¹⁴⁹ Acts ii, 41.¹⁵⁰ *Ib.* vi, 7.¹⁵¹ *Ib.* v, 30, 31.

sion has failed, and given place to the theory of fraud. As Dr. Schaff justly remarks :

“The Vision hypothesis, instead of getting rid of the miracle, only shifts it from fact to fiction; it makes an empty delusion more powerful than the truth, or turns all history into delusion. Before we can reason the resurrection of Christ out of history we must reason the apostles and Christianity out of existence. We must either admit the miracle or frankly confess that we stand before an inexplicable mystery.” “This illusion we are expected to believe by these unbelievers, gave birth to the most real and most mighty of all facts, the Christian Church, which has lasted these eighteen hundred years, and is now spread all over the civilized world, embracing more members than ever, and exercising more moral power than all other religions combined.”¹⁵²

Certainly it can not be claimed that the delusion supposed could have been due to the favorable predisposition and anticipation of the apostles. The plain record relied upon renders that proposition utterly untenable. When the Magdalene went alone and reported to the apostles that she had seen Jesus alive, they only “mourned and wept,” and “they believed not.” When the women went together and “told these things unto the apostles, their words seemed to them as idle tales, and they believed them not.” When Jesus “appeared unto the eleven as they sat at meat” he “upbraided them with their unbelief and hardness of heart because they believed not them which had seen him after he was risen.” When all the apostles in their turn told Thomas, “We have seen the Lord,” Thomas replied, “Except I shall see in his hands the print of the nails, and put my finger into the print of the nails, . . . I will not believe.” And even after this, when Jesus was seen by the multitude in the mountain in Galilee, “some doubted.” Evidently these facts and this language do not admit, but are absolutely destructive of, the theory that delusion arose out of the expectation of the apostles that Jesus would rise from the sepulcher of death.

Nor can it be denied that these witnesses had opportunity under every variety of circumstances to see and test the reality

¹⁵² *Hist. Christ. Church*, 1, p. 183.

of the risen Jesus; for he is recorded as seen by witnesses; some at a distance, but oftener close at hand; sometimes individually by persons alone, but oftener by small gatherings, as the apostles, or by the great multitude together. He was seen in the light of the early morning, as by Mary Magdalene at the sepulcher; he was seen in the brightness of the noonday sun, as by Paul journeying to Damascus; he was seen toward the close of the afternoon, as by the two who talked with him on the way to Emmaus; he was seen under the cover of night, as by the apostles as they sat at meat in Jerusalem; he was seen by the disciples at their nets at the seaside, by the multitude on the mountains of Galilee, by two of the Seventy in the country on the public highway, as well as in the city full, by those who had not rejected him; and by all in the nearest possible personal relations. Their sight was confirmed by the sense of touch, for some came and held him by the feet. He himself said to his disciples: "Behold my hands and my feet that it is I myself; handle me and see; for a spirit hath not flesh and bones as ye see me have. And when he said this, he showed them his hands and his feet." But he was cognized not only by the sight of their eyes, but also his voice was heard by their ears. For altogether unlike the stories of the silent specters, there were occasions when he conversed familiarly and at great length with his friends, at once demonstrating the fact of his resurrection and teaching them the special significance of his rising in its relation to the future Church, "speaking to them of the things pertaining to the kingdom of God." And withal Jesus ate fish *in the presence* of his disciples, to identify himself to their fullest recognition; and he *ate at the table with his disciples*, as in the old-time fellowship of his ministry. So that these witnesses tested and attested without hesitation or qualification:

"Him God raised up on the third day, and showed him openly, not to all the people, but unto witnesses chosen of God, *even to us who did*

*eat and drink with him after he rose from the dead.*¹⁵³ For “*He was seen many days of them that came up with him from Galilee to Jerusalem, who were witnesses unto the people.*”¹⁵⁴

So that it is conclusive that Jesus was seen alive after his death, not by one single person alone, or by merely one class of persons apart, or on one transient occasion, or on many transient occasions, but often and continuously, and by as many as a great multitude, and for a period of forty days.

The eminent Bishop Westcott pointedly remarks :

“The ground on which the apostles rested their appeal was the resurrection; the function which they claimed for themselves was to bear witness to it. Their belief was not an idle assent, but the spring of a new life. And the belief itself was of a new kind. It was not like the affectionate credulity with which an oppressed state or party believes in the reappearance of a lost leader. It was a confession of error before it was an assertion of faith. It involved a renunciation of popular dogmas in which those who held it had been reared. It proclaimed a truth altogether new and unlike any which men had held before. If ever the idea of delusion can be excluded, it must be in a case when it is alleged to explain a conviction which transformed at once the cherished opinions of a large body of men of various characters and powers, for which outwardly they had no inclination or advantage.”¹⁵⁵

The eminent Dr. Keim, who once advocated this theory in a modified form, afterward stated :

“The unhesitating denial of the resurrection in spite of the serious difficulties which exist in conflict with the belief of so many among the laity, *is the fruit of neither a scientific nor a religious conscience.* We are not able to comprehend how the Christian Church, with all its clearness of mind, with all its earnestness of moral purpose, could have been founded as the result of an overexcited vision.”

To this Dr. Schaff adds this further testimony :

“In his last word on the great problem, Keim, in view of the exhaustion and failure of the natural explanations [of the resurrection], comes to the conclusion that we must either humbly confess our ignorance or return to the faith of the apostles who have seen the Lord.”¹⁵⁶

¹⁵³ Acts x, 40, 41. ¹⁵⁴ *Ib.* xiii, 31. ¹⁵⁵ *Gospel of the Resurrection*, p. 124.

¹⁵⁶ See Schaff's *Hist. Christ. Church*, Vol. I, p. 185.

It is related of Cardinal Talleyrand, of Paris, that he was once approached by Larevelliere-Lepeaux, who was a member of the French Directory, a Deistical philanthropist, who was the originator of a new religion to displace Christianity; but to his great disappointment he could not get his propaganda introduced. He sought counsel of the cardinal, who seemed to condole with him, but said that the introduction of a new religion was no easy task. The polite but shrewd cardinal hesitatingly suggested that there remained one thing which would give hope of success. "What is it?" said Lepeaux. "It is this," replied the cardinal: "Go and be crucified, then be buried, and then rise again on the third day; and then go right on working miracles—raising the dead, healing all manner of diseases, and casting out demons, and possibly you might succeed!" The proposition had the suggestive effect, and he left the cardinal in silence.

III. THE WITNESS OF MODERN SKEPTICS.

The following concessions touching the resurrection of Jesus made by modern skeptics have their evidential value. The several authors cited are recognized as of the foremost scholarly critics of the negative school; and the perfect candor with which they treat the subject entitles the writers to profound respect.

Dr. Theodore Keim, of Zürich, whose *Life of Christ* is §206. Conces- regarded as altogether the best production emanating from the school of Freethinkers, says:
sion of
 Dr. Keim.

"After all these considerations, we shall have to admit that the recent and strongly-favored theory is nothing but an hypothesis which explains some things, but leaves the main point unexplained, even as the main facts which have been historically subjected to wrong and weak points of view. But if the attempt equally fails to maintain the traditional history of the resurrection; if the attempt by means of visions of St. Paul fails to build up a natural explanation of things which happened,—there remains for history no other way than the admission that the voluble statements of the legendary history, and the dark brevity of the authentic history, do not allow us to establish a certain invincible result

of the enigmatical termination of the life of Jesus, however important they may have been in themselves and in their influence upon universal history. For the benefit of history, in so far as it calculates with known factors and with a series of tangible recognized causes and effects, there exists the undoubted fact, only the firm faith of the apostles that Jesus has risen, and the immense effect by this faith, namely, the conversion of mankind."¹⁵⁷

Dr. Georg Heinrich August von Ewald, of Göttingen (died 1875), in *History of the Apostolic Age*, held that Christ's resurrection was wholly *spiritual*, a continuous manifestation of him, whatever that may mean. He says:

§ 207. Concession of Dr. Ewald.

"Nothing is historically more certain than that Christ rose from the dead, and appeared to his own; and that this their vision was the beginning of their higher faith and of all their Christian labors." "But it is just as certain that they saw him again—not as an ordinary man, or as a shadow rising out of the grave, or as a ghost, as the legend tells us of such—but as the only Son of God; as an absolutely superior and supreme Being; and that when thinking of the past they could not imagine otherwise than that whoever was favored to see him again, had also immediately recognized his sole Divine dignity, and that they have firmly believed on him. But as the true King and Son of God, the Twelve and others had already learned to know him during his lifetime; the only difference being that they now recollect him also in regard to his purely Divine side, and by that as a Conqueror of Death. There is, consequently, after all, the earthly Christ as he was known to them so well, and an inner relationship between that usual beholding of Jesus and that higher rapturous beholding of the heavenly Christ; so that they would not have recognized him even in these first days and weeks after his death as the heavenly Messiah, had they not known him previously so well as the earthly one."¹⁵⁸

Dr. Daniel Schenkel of Heidelberg, when advocating the Vision or Hallucination theory of a real but purely spiritual manifestation of Christ, though thoroughly convinced that on this fact rests the institution of the Christian Church, acknowledged himself unable to solve the problem of the resurrection of Jesus, and says:

§ 208. Concession of Dr. Schenkel.

"Never will historical investigation succeed in solving the enigma of the belief in the resurrection. But nothing is more sure in history than the fact that on the belief in this rests the institution of the Christian Church. . . . Over against this hypothesis of visions which

¹⁵⁷ *Geschichte Jesu von Nazara*, iii, 600. Keim died in Giessen in 1879.

¹⁵⁸ *Hist. of the Apostolic Age* (Geschichte des Volkes Israel, Vol. VI, 52, 69, sqq.)

tries to explain the appearances of Christ to his disciples as illusions of the senses, having their origin physical and therefore psychical in the intensification of the nervous and intellectual life, stands especially the keynote of the mood in the disciples, especially in Peter—the deep sadness, very humble self-confidence, the lost courage for life; how from such a mood proceeded the transfigured image of the resurrected One, with this absolute certainty and indestructible joy through which the belief in the resurrection was able to firmly maintain the Church in all storms and persecutions?”¹⁵⁹

Dr. Ferdinand Christian Baur, of Tübingen, who is called
 § 209. Con- “the master-critic” of the skeptical Church his-
 cession of torians, and “the corypheus” of the Tübingen
 Dr. Baur. school, in his revised edition of the *First Three
 Centuries*,¹⁶⁰ published just before he died (in 1860), says:

“Nothing but the miracle of the resurrection could disperse the doubts which threatened to drive faith into the eternal night of death.”
 ‘It is true that the nature of the resurrection lies outside of historical investigation, . . . for to the faith of the disciples the resurrection of Jesus became a most solid and most irrefutable certainty. In whatever light we may consider the resurrection of Jesus, whether as an actual objective miracle or a subjective psychological one, even granting the possibility of such a miracle, no psychological analysis can penetrate the inner spiritual process by which, in the consciousness of the disciples, their belief at the death of Jesus was transformed into a belief of his resurrection. . . . We must rest satisfied with this: that for them the resurrection of Christ was a fact of their consciousness, and had for them all the reality of an historical event.’ “While the historical criticism has nothing to do with the inquiry concerning what the resurrection was in fact, it must hold fast to the assertion that, in the belief of the first disciples, it had become an established and incontrovertible certainty. What was presupposed as the essential foundation of this history is not the fact that Jesus rose from the dead, but that it was believed that he had risen. However we may seek to explain the faith, the resurrection of Jesus had become to the first Christians a fact of conviction, and had for them all the reality of an historical fact.”

In consideration of the failure of these efforts to explain the resurrection of Jesus on mere natural principles, the force
 § 210. The and truth expressed by Beyschlag is sufficiently
 Close. manifest: “It is infinitely easier to admit that
 the Christian Church is the offspring of a miracle than to
 imagine it to be born of a lie.” Upon the other hand, the

¹⁵⁹ *Charakterbild Jesu*, p. 231, sqq., 1864.

¹⁶⁰ *Geschichte der Christ. Kirche*, Band 1, S. 39, f. (Vol. I, pp. 39, 48, 42).

intelligent and thoughtful mind must ever be impressed with a sense of the utter futility, not to say frivolity, of attempting to found Christianity upon a *swoon*, or a *delusion*, and thence perpetuated itself with such high character and great principles for living, amidst the fiercest oppositions of every kind, down through the centuries. Now, in consideration of what the Christian system *is in itself*, and what it teaches, enjoins, and enforces upon those who embrace it; of the place and power which it has attained and maintained among the best and foremost civilizations of the world; how it has introduced a new course of history for mankind; how its principles have gained credence and become incorporated into the best governments of the most advanced nations of the earth, modifying the horrors of war, bringing honor and prosperity in times of peace, enforcing equity and uprightness between man and man in society, giving happiness in the relations of the family in the home, enjoining purity of character and life upon the individual, imparting a strengthening with noble courage to meet the severest trials in our probation, and withal, inspiring in the Christian an imperishable hope of the immortal life beyond death,—these considerations legitimate the induction that the Christian religion is founded, not upon an imaginary swoon or delusion, but upon a fact and truth supreme, that its Founder, Jesus Christ, must have risen, and actually did rise from the dead—an event proportionate with such results—as is affirmed by the apostles who saw him alive again, and has ever been steadfastly believed by all Christians in all Christendom.

1. The negation of his resurrection raises greater difficulties than the miracle itself.
2. This supernatural event has never been refuted by adversaries on historical grounds.
3. The admission of his resurrection renders easy the admission of other miracles also.
4. The resurrection of Christ opens the gates of immortality to all believers in Christ.

CHAPTER XI.

THE ASCENSION OF JESUS CHRIST.

1. THE SCRIPTURAL REPRESENTATIONS OF THE ASCENSION.
2. THE FACT EITHER CONCEDED OR AFFIRMED BY ADVERSARIES.
By Rabbinical Writers: the Targum, Talmud, and Toledoth Jeshu.
By Roman Writers who affirm it: Hierocles and Porphyry.
3. THE EVENT PERPETUATED LATER HISTORICALLY IN CURRENT LITERATURE.
By the Ancient Fathers: Barnabas, Polycarp, and Irenæus.
By Christian Apologists: Aristides, Justin, Melito; and Tertullian.
4. THE TEACHING OF THE APOSTLES RESPECTING THE ASCENSION.
By Paul in his First Four Epistles.
By the Apostle John in the Book of Revelation.
5. AN ANALYSIS OF THE EVIDENCE ADDUCED, AND THE CONCLUSION.

CHAPTER XI.

THE ASCENSION OF JESUS CHRIST.

§211. Sources: Biographical Epitome, and Literature

1. MELITO (A. D. 170) was Bishop of Sardis, the ancient capital of Lydia, in Asia Minor. When he was made bishop is unknown; but after the death of Aurelius Verus (169), Melito addressed an *Apology* to the Emperor Marcus Antoninus (reigned 161-180). But little is known of his life; yet for many years he was the contemporary of Polycarp. Tertullian refers to his "elegant and oratorical genius."

In order to secure a thoroughly-authenticated catalogue of the books of the New Testament he visited Palestine and its various localities, where prophetic utterances first found expression, and where facts occurred in fulfillment of the prophecies. Melito says that one Onesimus, who was a Christian, requested him "to make selections for him from the Law and the Prophets concerning the Savior and the Christian faith, as he desired to learn accurately the account of the old books, and having therefore gone to the East and reached the spot where [everything] was preached and done, and having learned accurately the books of the Old Testament, I have sent a list of them." (Westcott, *Canon*, 221.) This catalogue is cited in detail in Eusebius (*Ecl. Hist.* iv, c. 26). From a rediscovered Syriac document containing Melito's treatise on Faith, translated by Dr. Cureton, the original of which is in the British Museum, we have the Confession of this period:

"We have made collections from the Law and the Prophets relative to those things which have been declared respecting our Lord Jesus Christ, . . . who in David and the prophets foretold his own sufferings; who was incarnate in the Virgin, who was born in Bethlehem, who was wrapped in swaddling clothes in a manger, who was seen of the shepherds, who was glorified by angels, who was worshiped by the Magi, who was pointed out by John [the Baptist], who assembled the apostles, who preached the Kingdom, who healed the maimed, who gave light to the blind, who raised the dead, who appeared in the temple, who was believed on by the people, who was betrayed by Judas, who was laid hold on by the priests, who was condemned by Pilate, who was

pierced in the flesh, who was hanged on the tree, who was buried in the earth, who rose from the dead, who appeared to the apostles, who ascended to heaven, who sitteth at the right hand of the Father, . . . who is God, the Son who is of the Father, Jesus Christ, the King for ever and ever. Amen." (West. Canon, 224-226.)

§ 212. Ascension of Jesus Christ.

Had nothing been told us about the fortieth day, we should not need to doubt that He lived glorified above; but now we know from trustworthy sources that he was exalted. We have no single reason to reject with distrust this satisfactory conclusion to the history of his earthly life.—VAN OOSTERZEE.

The ascension of the Lord forms the close of the resurrection, and the perfecting expression and act of exaltation.—MARTENSEN.

It is desirable that the close of the last vision which was common to all the apostles when he delivered to them his last commands, Jesus should be taken up into heaven.—RÉNAN.

Ἐπιστεῖθη ἐν κόσμῳ, ἀνελήφθη ἐν δόξῃ—Believed on in the world, received up into glory.—PAUL.

This Jesus hath God raised up whereof we all are witnesses; wherefore being by the right hand of God exalted, and having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Spirit, he hath shed forth this which ye do see and hear. For David is not ascended into the heavens, but he saith unto my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand until I make thy foes thy footstool.—PETER.

ARGUMENT.

The resurrection and ascension of Jesus are distinct facts in themselves, yet are they so interrelated in nature and doctrine as to be regarded as inseparable. This is clearly discernible in the history of our Lord's earthly existence, as it is also in thought in the system of Christian truth. The apostles place the two events together in equal prominence and side by side in laying the foundations of Christianity. His resurrection from the dead having been known as miraculous, it is easy to understand that his ascension naturally follows and is necessitated.

In the upward path of progress in the revelation of himself from his estate of humiliation to that of his exaltation, his rising from death to life marks *the first stage*; and his ascension on high marks the transitional period in his passage between earth and heaven in his return to the Father, from his redemptive work accomplished to that of intercession, and marks *the second stage*; while the *third* is that realized when Jesus assumed the place of

power and royalty upon his indestructible throne as "KING, ETERNAL, IMMORTAL, INVISIBLE, THE ONLY WISE GOD."¹ It is thus that the ascension serves as a connecting link in the chain of events which at once reveals his supreme nature, his authority, and his glory with the Father. And as his resurrection furnished ample opportunity for his identification to believers as being that same One who was crucified and was dead and buried, so his ascension into heaven serves to illustrate his identification in second coming, both in fact and method, when "this same Jesus who was taken up from you into heaven shall so come in like manner as ye have seen him go into heaven."² So that his return to earth in judgment at the end of the world is not only the sequel of his ascending to heaven, but completes the circle of his prerogatives as "THE CHRIST ACCORDING TO THE FLESH, WHO IS OVER ALL, GOD BLESSED FOR EVERMORE. AMEN."³

1. The Scriptural Representations of the Ascension.
2. The Fact conceded and affirmed by Adversaries.
3. Its Truth perpetuated in the Current History.
4. The Case defended by the Christian Apologists.
5. The Apostolic Teaching respecting the Ascension.
6. A Summing Up on all the Testimonies here adduced.

An epitome of what is said in the Scriptures by Jesus respecting his ascension may helpfully precede and furnish the fact itself which is to be proved. Matthew, though silent as regards the one circumstance that Jesus ascended on the fortieth day after his rising, when "a cloud received him out of their sight," records other facts in which this is conveyed by necessary implication. This is brought clearly to view in his report of the controversy which he had with the Pharisees, when the Lord asked them:

§ 213. The Witness of Jesus Himself.

"How then doth David in Spirit call Him Lord, saying, The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand till I make thine enemies thy footstool?"⁴ To his disciples Jesus said: "Then shall appear the sign of the Son of man in heaven, . . . and they shall see the Son of man coming in the clouds of heaven, with power and great glory,"⁵ "and all the holy angels with him; then shall he sit upon the throne of His glory."⁶ Again in the Sanhedrin, Caiaphas the high priest, said unto Jesus: "I adjure thee by the living God that thou tell us whether

¹ 1 Tim. i, 17.

² Acts i, 11.

³ Rom. ix, 5.

⁴ Matt. xxii, 43, 44.

⁵ *Ib.* xxiv, 30.

⁶ *Ib.* xxv, 31.

thou be the Christ, the Son of God. Jesus said unto him, Thou hast said. Nevertheless, I say unto you, Hereafter ye shall see the Son of man sitting at the right hand of power, and *coming in the clouds of heaven!*"⁷

There was special significance in Christ's mentioning before the Jewish Senate that hereafter he would occupy the place of power, "*coming in the clouds of heaven.*" To their knowing minds it was a distinct claim that he was the realization of Daniel's prediction.⁸ So that if the circumstance which characterized the great day of Christ's departure from earth is not remarked by this Evangelist, his *return from heaven to earth* "in power and great glory" is specially and certainly set forth by Matthew with sufficient explicitness and distinction. Dr. Neander observes :

"Even if none of the apostolic writers had mentioned this visible and real fact, we might have safely inferred from all that they say of Christ, that, in some form or other, they *presupposed* a supernatural exaltation from this visible earthly world."⁹

Mark's statement respecting the ascension of Christ is exceedingly brief and pointed. He compresses into a single sentence his entire deliverance on the sublime event which closed the earthly life and history of our Lord. It is this :

"So then the Lord Jesus, after he had spoken unto them, was received up into heaven, and sat down at the right hand of God."¹⁰

Luke, at the close of his Gospel, as well as at the beginning of his Book of Acts, furnishes some interesting particulars touching the ascension. Professedly he voices the circumstances of the occasion as stated by the apostles themselves, and by Mary the mother of Jesus, and others from whom he immediately derived his authenticated information. Grouping only those details which, as most important, we at this remote

⁷ Matt. xxvi, 63, 64.

⁸ Dan. vii, 13, 14.

⁹ *Life of Jesus*, c. ix.

¹⁰ Mark xvi, 19, of A. V., but omitted in two oldest MSS.

period most naturally are concerned to know, he says in his Gospel:

“And he led them out until they were over against Bethany; and he lifted up his hands and blessed them. And it came to pass while he blessed them, he parted from them, and was carried up into heaven.”¹¹

He opens his Acts of the Apostles by speaking—

“Concerning all that Jesus began both to do and to teach, until the day in which he was taken up, after that he had given commandment through the Holy Ghost unto the apostles whom he had chosen. . . . And when he had said these things, as they were looking, he was taken up; and a cloud received him out of their sight. And while they were looking steadfastly into heaven as he went, behold, two men stood by them in white apparel, who also said, Ye men of Galilee, why stand ye looking into heaven? This Jesus, who was received up from you into heaven, shall so come in like manner as ye beheld him going into heaven. Then returned they unto Jerusalem from the mount called Olivet, which is nigh unto Jerusalem, a Sabbath-day’s journey off.”¹²

John also, as Matthew, records the sayings of Jesus himself, in these words:

“I go to prepare a place for you. And if I go and prepare a place for you, I come again, and will receive you unto myself, that where I am, there ye may be also.”¹³ “I came out from the Father, and am come into the world; again I leave the world, and go unto the Father.”¹⁴ “And no man hath ascended into heaven, but he that descended out of heaven, even the Son of man.”¹⁵ “What then if ye should behold the Son of man ascending where he was before?”¹⁶ “Touch me not, for I am not yet ascended unto my Father.”¹⁷

These are very explicit teachings of Christ touching his translation from earth to heaven. To the understanding of his disciples it was unusually clear and satisfactory. They exclaim: “Lo, now speakest thou plainly and speakest no proverb.”¹⁸ So that the teachings of Jesus on this point were no mere imitations.

Simon Peter, with great energy and persistency of purpose, bears witness, both orally and in writing, respecting the ascension and the doctrines involved.

§ 215. Peter and the Ascension.

¹¹ Luke xxiv, 50, 51.

¹² Acts 1, 1, 2, 9-12.

¹³ John xiv, 2, 3.

¹⁴ *Ib.* xvi, 28;

¹⁵ *Ib.* iii, 13.

¹⁶ *Ib.* vi, 62.

¹⁷ *Ib.* xx, 17.

¹⁸ *Ib.* xvi, 29, *παρρησια* with *unreservedness*; . . . *παρομιλα*, no figurative saying.

Referring to the patriarch David, he solemnly affirms that God had

“Sworn with an oath to him, that of the fruit of his loins, *One* should sit upon his throne. He, foreseeing this, spake of the resurrection of the Christ. . . . Being therefore by the right hand of God exalted, and having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Ghost, he hath poured out this which ye see and hear. For David ascended not into the heavens; but he saith himself, The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand till I make thine enemies the footstool of thy feet. Let all the house of Israel therefore know assuredly that God hath made him both Lord and Christ, this Jesus whom ye crucified.” “And that he may send the Christ who hath been appointed for you, even Jesus; whom the heavens must receive until the times of restoration of all things whereof God spake by the mouth of his holy prophets, who have been since the world began.” “Him did God exalt with his right hand to be a Prince and a Savior to give repentance to Israel and remission of sins,” “who is on the right hand of God, having gone into the heaven, angels and authorities and powers being made subject unto him.”¹⁹

§ 216. Stephen and the Ascension. Before the Sanhedrin, Stephen witnessed the exaltation of the ascended Christ, when “being full of the Holy Ghost, he looked up steadfastly into heaven, and saw the glory of God, and Jesus standing on the right hand of God.”²⁰

To *confirm* these testimonies respecting the ascension in connection with the resurrection of Jesus, it remains to present the witness of profane writers who were hostile to Christ and Christianity. For it is made evident by both friends and foes, who had a right to know the truth whereof they affirm, that, rising from the dead, Jesus ascended into heaven, and assumed there the prerogatives of royalty. “He, because he abideth forever, hath his priesthood unchangeable; wherefore also he is able to save to the uttermost them that draw near unto God through him, seeing he ever liveth to make intercession for them.”²¹

¹⁹ Acts ii, 30, 33, 36; iii, 20, 21; v, 30, 31; 1 Pet. iii, 21, 22.

²⁰ Acts vii, 55, 56.

²¹ Heb. vii, 24, 25.

a) Rabbinical writers have been careful to note that "*Jesus calls himself the Son of man coming in the clouds of heaven, and also Son of the clouds.*"²² The word "*änän*"²³ in the *Targum*, signifies "*clouds,*" and is one of the designations of the *Messiah*. The significance of this reference to Daniel was understood by the Sanhedrists when Jesus was on trial before that Senate of judicature, and said to the president Caiaphas: "*Hereafter ye shall see the Son of man sitting at the right hand of power, and coming in the clouds of heaven.*"²⁴ On Christ's part, it was an acknowledgment of his claim and title to the Messiahship.

The *Toledoth Jeshu* also mentions that "Jesus predicted his own ascension into heaven." It gives the added testimony that he appropriated to himself two pre-eminent Psalms, the second, "Why do the heathen rage?" etc.; and the one hundred and tenth, "The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand until I make thine enemies thy footstool," etc.²⁵

β) *Two Roman writers* also bear brief but pointed witness to Christ's ascension: Hierocles, who acknowledges that "*Jesus ascended to heaven,*"²⁶ and Porphyry, when he says:

"*That pious soul who ascended to heaven had, by a certain fatality, become an occasion of error to those who were destined to have no share in the gifts of the gods, and in the knowledge of the eternal Zeus.*"²⁷

The testimony of the Apostolic Fathers means the original teaching of the apostles to their immediate pupils. This furnishes a connecting link in the historical succession of the Church from the apostles, who saw Jesus ascending from the mount of Olives, up through that crystal fiery atmosphere of the Orient, until "a cloud received" and charioted him away into the invisible world. This

²² *Bab. Tal.* Sanhed. 98, a; on Dan. vii, 13; עִמְּךָ שָׁמַיְמָא; also Sanhed. 96 b; comp. Matt. xxiv, 30; xxvi, 64.

²³ עָנָן 1 Chron. iii, 24; Ber. Rab. Gen. xxviii, 10.

²⁴ Matt. xxvi, 64; comp. Luke xxii, 69.

²⁵ Matt. xxii, 44; Mark xii, 36; Luke xx, 41-43; Acts ii, 35; Heb. i, 13.

²⁶ *Lard.* vii, 494. ²⁷ Neander, *Church Hist.* i, 173.

illustrates the universal faith, as it demonstrates the Christ exalted and glorified. The claim of the ascension originated in the event itself, and no question of the fact is recorded by friend or foe, that Jesus ascended into heaven. Upon the contrary, much is affirmed by both classes to justify the claim.

Barnabus (A. D. 70-79): "Wherefore also we keep the eighth day for rejoicing in which also Jesus rose from the dead, and having been manifested he ascended into the heavens."²⁸

Polycarp (A. D. 155): "For that ye have believed on Him that raised up our Lord Jesus Christ from the dead, and gave him glory and a throne at his own right hand, unto whom all things were made subject, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, . . . who cometh as Judge of quick and dead."²⁹

To this patristic testimony is now to be added that of a disciple of Polycarp, who was the disciple of the Apostle John who witnessed the Lord's ascension. There is but one intervening person in the line of teaching and current history of the fact, between John, the original witness of the ascending Christ, and Irenæus, who affirms and proclaims the universal faith of Christendom in the fact. Irenæus (A. D. 177), then Bishop of Lyons affirmed:

"The Church, though dispersed through the whole world, even to the ends of the earth, has received from the apostles and their disciples this faith: [We believe] "*In one God the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth and of the sea and all things that are in them; and in one Christ Jesus, the Son of God, who became incarnate for our salvation; and in the Holy Spirit, who proclaimed through the prophets the dispensations of God, and the advents, and the birth of the virgin, and the passion, and of the resurrection of the dead, AND THE ASCENSION INTO HEAVEN IN THE FLESH OF THE BELOVED CHRIST JESUS OUR LORD; AND HIS MANIFESTATION FROM HEAVEN IN THE GLORY OF THE FATHER,*"³⁰ etc.

Aristides (A. D. 123) says: "This is taught from the Gospel which a little while ago was spoken among them as preached, wherein if ye will also read ye will comprehend the power that is upon it. . . . He was also pierced by the Jews, and died, and was buried; and they say that after three days he rose and ascended; and then these twelve disciples went forth into the known parts of the world, and taught his greatness with all humility and sobriety."

§219. Wit-
ness of the
Apologists.

²⁸ Bar. Epistle, c. 15.

²⁹ Poly. Epis. to Philipp. c. 2.

³⁰ Iren. vs. Heresies, B. 1, c. 10.

The newly-found *Apology* of Aristides contains also most of the "Apostles' Creed." The omissions are indicated by stars. It reads:³¹

" We believe in one God Almighty,
 Maker of heaven and earth,
 And in Jesus Christ his Son,
 * * * * *
 Born of the Virgin Mary.
 * * * * *
 He was pierced by the Jews,
 He died and was buried,
 AND THE THIRD DAY HE ROSE AGAIN;
 HE ASCENDED INTO HEAVEN.
 * * * * *
 He is about to come to judge."

Justin Martyr (A. D. 145): "After you had crucified him, the only blameless and righteous Man, . . . when you knew that he had risen from the dead and ascended to heaven, as the prophets foretold he would, you not only did not repent of the wickedness which you had committed,"³² etc.

Melito (A. D. 170) wrote the Confession of the period in his treatise on *Faith*, in the newly-discovered *Syrian document*, which is in the British Museum.

" We have made collections from the Law and the Prophets relative to those things which have been declared respecting our Lord Jesus Christ, . . . who was incarnate in the Virgin, who was born in Bethlehem, . . . who was pointed out by John [Baptist], who assembled the apostles, . . . who was hanged on the tree, who was buried in the earth, who rose from the dead, who appeared to the apostles, who ascended to heaven, who sitteth at the right hand of the Father, . . . who is God, the Son who is the Father, Jesus Christ the King for ever and ever. Amen."³³

Tertullian (A. D. 200), in his wonderfully able and eloquent *Apology*, says:

"He spent forty days with some of his disciples down in Galilee, . . . instructing them in the doctrines which they were to teach others. Therefore, having given them commission to preach the gospel through the world, he was encompassed with a cloud and taken up to heaven."³⁴

³¹ *Apology*, 25.

³³ Cited in West. *Canon of N. T.* 224-226.

³² *Dialogue with Trypho*, 17.

³⁴ *Apol.* c. 21.

The universal consensus of negative critics admits, as genuine and credible, Paul's first four Epistles and John's Book of Revelation. The testimony of these apostles is not that they saw Jesus in the act of ascending, but that he was seen alive in heaven—a fact which necessitates the induction that the Lord had first literally ascended thither, as the Gospels record.

a) Paul says:

“As I made my journey and drew nigh unto Damascus, about noon, suddenly there shone from heaven a great light round about me. And I fell to the ground, and heard a voice saying unto me, Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me? And I answered, Who art thou, Lord? And he said unto me, I am Jesus of Nazareth whom thou persecutest.”³⁵ “Have I not seen Jesus our Lord?”³⁶ “And last of all, as unto one born out of due time, he appeared unto me also.”³⁷ “Say not in thy heart, Who shall ascend into heaven? (that is, to bring Christ down): or Who shall descend into the abyss? (that is, to bring Christ up from the dead).”³⁸ “For to this end Christ died, and lived again, that he might be Lord of both the dead and the living.”³⁹ “It was Christ Jesus that died, yea, rather, that was raised from the dead, who is at the right hand of God, who also maketh intercession for us.”⁴⁰

β) John, the apostle of Jesus, gives this witness in the first chapter of the Apocalypse:

“Grace to you . . . from Jesus Christ, who is the faithful Witness, the Firstborn of the dead, and Ruler of the kings of the earth. . . . Behold, he cometh with the clouds, and every eye shall see him, and they that pierced him; and all the tribes of the earth shall mourn over him. Even so, Amen. I am the Alpha and the Omega, saith the Lord God, who is, and who was, and who is to come, the Almighty.” “Fear not; I am the First and the Last, and the Living One; and I was dead, and behold, I am alive for evermore; and I have the keys of death and Hades. Write therefore the things which thou sawest.”⁴¹

§221. Analysis of the Evidence Adduced.

The chief evidence here adduced is twofold,—to substantiate the fact of Christ's literal ascension to, and spiritual royalty in heaven, as well as the peculiar manner of his second

³⁵ Acts xxii, 6-8.

³⁶ 1 Cor. ix, 1.

³⁷ *Ib.* xv, 8.

³⁸ Rom. x, 6, 7.

³⁹ *Ib.* xiv, 9.

⁴⁰ *Ib.* viii, 34; comp. Eph. i, 20; Col. iii, 1; 1 Pet. iii, 22; Heb. i, 3; ix, 24; viii, 1; x, 12; xi, 2.

⁴¹ Rev. i, 4, 5, 7, 8, 17-19.

advent to earth at the end of time, as the Scriptures affirm. The testimony is furnished alike by the adversaries and the adherents to Christianity. Of the enemies of the Christian religion there are two camps—the Jews and the Romans. Both were instinct with opposition which arises from the natural man. But their hostility was due to different motives. The Jews were characteristically malignant and persistent in their opposition to the Man of Nazareth, for the same spirit which had originally crucified his person was transmitted and traditionally taught to childhood both in the home and in the synagogue. But the Roman hostility arose partly from the hate and scorn which the Romans cherished toward all Jews, of whose blood and nation the apostles and the first Christians were; but more especially from what they regarded as considerations of patriotism, in that Christianity absolutely rejected and contemned all the Roman gods and the religion of the State.

It is quite natural, therefore, that the testimony of both parties to the Christian facts, if recorded at all, should be no more copious or cordial than a brief reference to given circumstances. It is to be noted, however, that neither the Jewish Rabbins nor the heathen Romans claim to have been personal witnesses of the ascension of Jesus Christ. The Jews testify that our Lord's ascension and his eternal royalty at the right hand of power were predicted by Christ himself, as well as his return to earth for judgment, "coming with the clouds of heaven," and so far they authenticate the words of Jesus as truly recorded in the Scriptures. But the Roman writers steadfastly affirm the ascension to have actually occurred. Upon the contrary, there is no known dissent respecting this occurrence. Now, if these enemies did not themselves see Jesus ascend from earth, their testimony does powerfully corroborate, *in the historical sense*, the witness of the apostles *who did see him* ascending in bodily form until "a cloud received him out of their sight." Why is it necessary that a

literary writer of reputation should be a personal witness of the events of which he is cognizant in current history, any more than the historian who constantly records events which he has never seen? Nay, how much more is to be received the testimony of those who were confessedly hostile to the Christian religion, and wrote to destroy it?

The rabbinical writers were particularly careful to record scant acknowledgment of anything that would seem to justify the Messianic character and claim of the Nazarene. But they own that "Jesus did predict his own ascension to heaven;" and that he appropriated to himself certain Psalms which the whole Jewish Church had always applied exclusively to the real Messiah. The evangelistic story states that the angel declared to the apostles at the ascension: "This same Jesus who is taken up from you into heaven, shall *so come in like manner as ye have seen him go into heaven;*" that as "a cloud [then] received him out of their sight," so will he return to earth encompassed "with the clouds of heaven." To Caiaphas and the Sanhedrists assembled to try Jesus, the Lord openly confessed that he was in truth the Son of God who would sit at the right hand of power, and would be seen of them thereafter returning to the earth amidst the clouds of heaven. The Jewish Talmud thence records Jesus idiomatically and ironically as "*the son of the clouds*" and as "*the son of man coming in the clouds of heaven.*" The *Targum* applies the appellation "clouds" to the Messiah exclusively. This indirect testimony by the Jewish writers is not without its evidential value. It not only admits Christ's historical existence, but, what is of much importance, it records his own claim as being their Messiah; their testimony consents to the fact that "he predicted his own ascension to heaven," and circumstantially describes that he will come again in the end as he went, encompassed with clouds.

Turning to the Romans, we find none of those idiomatic and figurative representations characteristic of the Jews' ex-

pression, but we have the literal affirmations of the ascended Lord. Both Hierocles and Porphyry acknowledge outright that "*Jesus ascended to heaven.*" Now, this conviction of the fact so thoroughly profound, entertained alike by foes and friends of Christ, remains to be explained, *if the ascension did not actually occur to give it origin.* It has ever been the universal belief of Christians, who hold the record of the fact. What produced this constant belief of friends and foes? If the occurrence is denied as being unhistorical, a satisfactory account of its origin without any fictitious assumptions is demanded of the disbeliever. For these heathen writers affirm the fact exactly accordant with the evangelistic narrative; accordant with the testimony of Stephen before the Sanhedrists, when he attested that he saw Jesus standing at the right hand of God; and accordant with the testimony of Paul, who affirmed that near Damascus he saw and talked with the ascended Jesus; and accordant with the testimony of John, who also attests that he saw Jesus on the Lord's day on the island Patmos. Such, then, is the apostolic teaching. The Johannean testimony carries this added force and effect: that John was himself present and personally witnessed the scene and circumstances when Jesus ascended; so afterward, when John was exiled in Patmos, he recognized the personality of him who announced himself as "the Alpha and Omega, the First and the Last, and the Living One, *who was dead, and behold I am alive for evermore.*" "*Behold he cometh with the clouds, and every eye shall see him, and they that pierced him.*"

To render this catenate of proofs complete and indisputable touching the ascension, the witness of *the Apostolic Fathers* is introduced, supported by their successors *the Christian Apologists*. These several testimonies evidence and illustrate what was "the faith once delivered to the saints" by those who were eye-witnesses of Christ's exaltation to glory. For if he was seen in heaven by Paul and John, as they affirm, he must first have ascended to heaven. The authenticity of this

great doctrinal fact in its simplicity and sublimity, is thus brought to view apart from all fictitious pretense of legendary accretions, and was the universal faith of the Christian Church from the beginning. The sequel, then, of Christ's resurrection was his ascension. He was thereby inducted to royalty and enthroned. And herein is the circle of his activities in the interests of mankind, in both place and power, made complete when he shall come to earth, encompassed with clouds, as when he ascended. It is now easy to understand the facts as real, and the proofs as conclusive and historical, relating to these two events leading from the sepulcher to the throne—from deepest humility to greatest royalty. These two facts are basal to the whole system of Christian doctrine.

The *Creeds* of the Church are but the crystalline expression of Christian beliefs. They summarize the principal facts and doctrines of the primitive Church. As indicative of the apostles' faith and teaching—though not *formulated* until some time after the Apostolic Age—it may be deemed in place to cite here

§ 222.
Creeds.

THE APOSTLES' CREED.

“I believe in God the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth; and in Jesus Christ his only Son our Lord; who was conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary; suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, dead, and buried. He descended into Hades. The third day he rose from the dead; *he ascended into heaven*, and sitteth at the right hand of God the Father Almighty; from thence he will come to judge the quick and the dead. I believe in the Holy Ghost; the holy catholic Church, the communion of Saints; the forgiveness of sins; the resurrection of the body; and the life everlasting. Amen.”

The reality of the great fact discussed in this chapter, besides verifying inductively the antiquity and authenticity of the New Testament, legitimates the following conclusions:

1. The ascension of Christ occurred visibly at the Mount of Olives.
2. This was the transitional period in his life between two worlds.

-
3. Christ's ascension inducted him to his proper place of royalty.
 4. The risen and ascended Christ identifies him as the Lord of Glory.
 5. His ascension to heaven forecasts his return as the Judge of men.

CHAPTER XII.

THE APOSTLES OF JESUS CHRIST AND THEIR WORK.

I. HISTORICITY OF THE PEOPLE CALLED CHRISTIANS.

1. Appellative "Christians" Applied First by the World.
2. Attested by the Common Literature of the Period.

II. HISTORICAL EXISTENCE OF CHRIST'S DISCIPLES.

1. Attested by the Enemies of Christianity.
2. Confirmed by the Friends of Christianity.
3. Analysis of the Several Testimonies Given.

III. JAMES, THE LORD'S BROTHER, ALSO AN APOSTLE.

1. Several Persons Named James in the New Testament.
2. James the Brother of Our Lord.
 - a) His Noble Character.
 - β) His Violent Death.
3. The Several Testimonies Reviewed.

IV. MIRACLES WROUGHT BY THE APOSTLES OF CHRIST.

1. Miracles as Accrediting Signs of Apostleship.
2. Miracles Manifold Wrought in Christ's Name.
3. Miracles Admitted by Foes with Explanations.

V. THE APOSTLES' MINISTRY ABROAD AMONG THE NATIONS.

1. The Common Voice of Disbelief Confirmed.
2. Christianity in Relation to the Roman Empire.
3. Cities and Centers Reached by the Apostles' Ministry.
4. Obstacles and Oppositions to the Diffusion of Religion.

INDUCTIONS.

CHAPTER XII.

THE APOSTLES OF JESUS CHRIST AND THEIR WORK.

§ 223. The Apostles of Jesus Christ and Their Work.

And the disciples were called Christians first at Antioch [Syria].—LUKE.

Nero . . . falsely charged with the guilt . . . the persons commonly called Christians. Christ, the founder of that name, had been put to death.—TACITUS.

And the sect of Christians, so named from Him, are not extinct at this day.—JOSEPHUS.

James, called the brother of our Lord, because he is called the son of Joseph.—EUSEBIUS.

Ananus . . . assembled the Sanhedrin of the Judges, and brought before them the brother of Jesus who was called Christ, whose name was James.—JOSEPHUS.

Go ye therefore, disciple all nations, . . . teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I commanded you.—JESUS.

And they went forth and preached everywhere, the Lord working with them, confirming the word by the signs following.—MARK.

ARGUMENT.

A principal fact in the Gospels is that Jesus Christ attracted to his person and ministry many disciples, who were afterward called apostles, to whom, in the first instance, was due the spread of the Christian religion. The enemies of Christianity either admit or affirm the discipleship to have been historical. Accordant with Jewish custom, the names of certain disciples are mentioned. Some adversaries refer to one "James, the brother of Jesus who was called Christ." It is quite certain that this James was not one of the original twelve disciples of Christ, but that he became an apostle by reason of the Lord's resurrection. All parties ascribe to James a pure and upright character. He died a martyr for his Christian faith.

The followers of Christ were early called Christians after his name. The disciples afterwards were designated apostles with reference to their great commission in being sent forth to the nations by Christ to preach his gospel. Having been invested with power from on

high at the great Pentecost, they began the work of their apostolate, first in Judæa, but afterward among the populations, civilizations, and great centers of the Roman Empire. Wherever they went, they published the saving power of Jesus Christ, and they wrought miracles in his name. The apostles and their successors met with an amazing success—a success which is not to be explained on any natural principles.

1. The Followers of Christ, from His name, were called Christians.
2. The Historical Existence of Persons known as Christ's Disciples.
3. James, who was the Brother of our Lord, also became His Apostle.
4. These Apostles wrought Miracles by the Name and Power of Christ.
5. They also went to the Nations, publishing His Gospel with Success.

I. CHRIST'S FOLLOWERS CALLED CHRISTIANS.

The Book of Acts records that "the disciples were called Christians first at Antioch." The designation had special reference to Christ, the Founder of the Christian religion. It was the remark of Athanasius, Bishop of Alexandria:

§ 224. The Appellative Christians.

"The Christian people never took their denomination from their own bishops, but from the Lord in whom we believe. And though the blessed apostles are our masters, and have administered to us the gospel of our Lord, we are not named from them. For from Christ we are, and are called Christians."¹

From the circumstance that the word Christian is derived from a Greek stem with a Latin termination, it is supposed that the appellation was of Roman origin, and was not assumed by the apostles in the first instance. Nevertheless, because of its reference to Christ, it was not unacceptable. Paul seems to have avoided its use altogether, even in the famous defense of his faith at Cæsarea, when Herod Agrippa II pronounced the name "Christian," perhaps sneeringly, and the apostle responded with such impressive dignity and courtesy to the king. Peter, however, employed the term with reference to its origin when he wrote:

¹ *Lard.* iv, 153.

“If ye be reproached for the name of Christ, happy are ye; . . . but let none of you suffer as a murderer, or as a thief, or as an evil doer, or as a meddler in other men’s matters. Yet if any one suffer *as a Christian*, let him not be ashamed, but let him glorify God in that name.”²

The appellation seems to have been in common use by foes and friends for a period of two centuries after the apostles. Josephus says that “the sect of Christians, so § 225. Common named from Him, are not extinct at this day.”³ in Literature. Tacitus mentions “Christ the founder of that name,” and declares that Nero “falsely charged with the guilt [of himself in burning Rome] those persons . . . commonly called Christians.”⁴ Pliny the younger, in his official *Letter to Trajan*, speaks of the judicial “trials of the Christians” who were “brought before him as Christians.” He says: “I asked them whether they were Christians;” some “confessed that they were Christians, but others denied it.”⁵ Suetonius, also referring to the burning of Rome, says of Nero that “he likewise inflicted punishments on the Christians.”* Celsus speaks of the first Jewish Christians as “deserters to another name, and another mode of life.”⁶ Lucian, mentioning one Peregrinus, says: “At which time he learned the wonderful doctrines of the Christians.”⁷ Porphyry refers to Origen, who “was in great esteem, . . . whose authority is very great with the teachers of this [new] doctrine, . . . who went over to this barbarian temerity, . . . living as a Christian, and contrary to the laws.”⁸ Aristides says: “Those who to-day believe in his preaching are called Christians, who are well known.”⁹ Tertullian says: “The outcry is that the State is filled with Christians; they are in the fields, in the citadels, in the islands. They make lamentation as for some calamity, that both sexes, every age and condition, even high rank, are passing over to the profession of the Christian faith.”¹⁰

* *Lives of the Cæsars*, Nero, c. 16.

² 1 Pet. iv, 14, 16.

⁵ *Epts.* x, 97.

⁸ *Ib.* p. 397.

³ *Ant.* xviii, 3, 3.

⁶ *Orig. con. Cels.* ii, 1.

⁹ *Apology.*

⁴ *Annals*, xv, 44, 45.

⁷ Cited by *Lard.* vii, 279.

¹⁰ *Apol.* c. 1.

This common usage in the current literature of those times proves the early origin of Christianity, and the authenticity of the references to Christians made by Luke and Peter.

II. HISTORICAL EXISTENCE OF THE DISCIPLES.

In ancient times it was usual for philosophers and teachers to have a following of those who were attracted to their presence for the purpose of receiving instruction. Socrates and Plato had their learners; John Baptist and Jesus had their disciples. After having spent a night in prayer, our Lord chose twelve men¹¹ whom he ordained to be the companions of his ministry, the witnesses of his miracles, and the learners of his doctrines. With such ample opportunities and advantages they were to be qualified to attest his own resurrection from the dead, his ascension to heaven, as well as to write the *memoirs* of his life, and then preach his gospel to the nations of the world. A *disciple* was a *follower* of Jesus; an *apostle* was *one sent* to publish salvation in his name unto all people. These chosen twelve disciples afterwards became his commissioned apostles. Of these twelve, however, "Judas by transgression fell," and one Matthias was chosen to take his place in the apostolate. Thenceforth the superstructure of Christianity was "built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone."^{*}

Now, those writers who were hostile to the Christian religion made a record which strongly confirms the history of the apostolate of Jesus as given in the historical part of the New Testament. They recognize and affirm the fact that our Lord did ordain and send forth his apostles to preach Christ's saving power.

1. Josephus mentions the broad fact of Christ's following:

"He drew after him many of the Jews and many of the Greeks."¹²

^{*} Eph. ii, 20; 1 Pet. ii, 6.

¹¹ Matt. x, 2-5; Mark iii, 14; Luke vi, 13-16; John vi, 70, 71; Acts 1, 18.

¹² *Ant.* xviii, 3, 3.

2. The Talmud mentions some of the disciples' names :

"The Rabbins have taught that there were five disciples of Jesus: Matthai [*i. e.*, Matthew], Thodah [Thaddeus], Nestor [Nazarene], Boni or Nikdimon ben Gorion [Nicodemus son of Gorion], and Nakai," either an unknown follower, or a fictitious name of a disciple. "Eleazor says: O Akiba, . . . as I was walking in the street of Zipporis I met one of the disciples of Jesus of Nazareth whose name is James."¹³

3. The *Toledoth Jeshu* mentions the exact number and vocation of the disciples :

"Jesus had twelve disciples, who traveled into the twelve kingdoms and prophesied of him. The people went after him, and some of them were reputable people, who confirmed the doctrine of Jeshu [Jesus], and they declared that they were his messengers." "They gathered a vast multitude of Israel," etc.

4. Celsus mentions Christ's disciples and what he conceived to be their character :

"Jesus having gathered around him ten or eleven persons of notorious character, the very wickedest of tax-gathers and sailors,¹⁴ . . . those who were his associates while [he was] alive, and who listened to his voice and enjoyed his instruction as their teacher."¹⁵ "They have forsaken the laws of their fathers in consequence of their minds being led captive by Jesus, . . . and they have become deserters to another name and another mode of life."¹⁶ "In the next place he was betrayed by [one of] those *whom he called his disciples*."¹⁷

5. Julian mentions the names of Christian converts who were reputable. Referring to Jesus and Paul, he says :

"They never expected you [Christians] to arrive at such power. They were content with deceiving maidservants and slaves, and by them some men and women, such as Cornelius and Sergius. If there were other men of eminence brought over to you—I mean in the time of Tiberius and Claudius, when these things happened—let me pass for a liar in everything I say."¹⁸

Respecting the apostles, there is abundant confirmation in the literature of the Christians § 228. The Records of Christians. belonging to the same period.

Barnabas says: "And when he chose his own apostles, who were to proclaim his gospel, . . . then he manifested himself to be the Son

¹³ *Bab. Tal.*, Sanhed. 43, a, Unexpurgated ed.

¹⁴ *Cels.* i, 62.

¹⁶ *Ib.* ii, 45,

¹⁶ *Ib.* ii, 1.

¹⁷ *Ib.* ii, 11.

¹⁸ *Lard.* vii, 630, 631.

of God. . . . They that preached unto us the forgiveness of sins and the purification of our heart, they to whom being twelve in number, for a testimony unto the twelve tribes—for there are twelve tribes of Israel—he gave authority over the gospel, that they should preach it.”¹⁹ Aristides says: “This Jesus . . . had twelve disciples, in order that a certain dispensation of his might be fulfilled. . . . He ascended [to heaven], and then these twelve disciples went forth into the known parts of the world, and taught concerning his greatness.”²⁰ Tertullian says: “He spent forty days with some of his disciples down in Galilee, a region in Judæa, instructing them in the doctrines they were to teach others. Thereafter, having given them commission to preach the gospel through the world, . . . his disciples also spreading over the world, did as their Divine Master bade them.”²¹ The Apostle Paul says: “Neither went I up to Jerusalem to those that were apostles before me. . . . But other apostles saw I none save James the Lord’s brother.” “He was seen of Cephas, then of the twelve. . . . After that he was seen of James, then of all the apostles.”²²

§ 229. An analysis of the foregoing testimonies yields
 Analysis of the following propositions confirmatory of facts
 Testimonies. affirmed in the Gospels:

1. That Jesus attracted to himself many disciples, both Jews and Gentiles. (Josephus.)
2. Some of the disciples of Christ are mentioned by name, by Jewish Rabbis. (Talmud.)
3. Through these disciples a very great multitude of Israel became believers. (Toledoth.)
4. The converts to Christianity went over to another name and mode of life. (Celsus.)
5. The chronology of these facts dates in the reign of Tiberius and Claudius. (Julian.)

CONFIRMATIONS

6. Barnabas confirms Toledoth as to twelve disciples according to the twelve tribes.
7. Aristides confirms Toledoth in the number and vocation of the apostles of Jesus.
8. Tertullian confirms Paul of Christ’s teaching in Galilee after his resurrection.²³

¹⁹ *Epis.* cc. 5, 8.

²⁰ *Apol.*

²¹ *Apol.* c. 21.

²² *Gal.* 1, 17-19: 11, 9; 1 *Cor.* xv, 5, 7.

²³ *Acts* xiii, 31.

9. Julian confirms Toledoth as to reputable standing of some Christian converts.
10. Paul confirms the Talmud in naming, and the Toledoth in numbering, the disciples.
11. And all the testimonies witness to the antiquity and truth of the New Testament.

III. JAMES THE BROTHER OF OUR LORD.

Four persons of eminence are named James in the New Testament: "James the Elder," "James the Little," "James the son of Alphæus," and "James the Lord's brother." § 230. Four named James.

James the Elder, was brother of the Apostle John, son of Zebedee.²⁴ These two were designated by Christ as "sons of thunder."²⁵ They both enjoyed special relations with Jesus in preparation for special services in their future apostolate. They, with Peter, were the favored three of the Twelve who were chosen to witness Christ's Messianic work when he raised the daughter of Jairus from the dead,²⁶ who were admitted to behold the glory of Christ's transfiguration "on the holy mount,"²⁷ and who witnessed the Lord's humiliation and agony in the garden Gethsemane.²⁸ This James was the first martyr, as John was the last survivor, of the twelve disciples. He was beheaded by order of Herod Agrippa I, in A. D. 44.²⁹

James the Little,³⁰ probably so called from his stature, was the son of a certain Mary and a brother of Joseph.³¹ His mother is named as one of the women from Galilee who brought sweet spices to the Savior's tomb.³² This James is quite commonly supposed to be the son of Alphæus, on the hypothesis that his mother was the wife of Cleopas, who was

²⁴ Matt. iv, 21; x, 2. ²⁵ Mark iii, 17. ²⁶ Mark v, 37; Luke viii, 41, 49-55.

²⁷ Matt. xvii, 1-13; Mark ix, 2-10; Luke ix, 28-36; 2 Pet. i, 17, 18.

²⁸ Matt. xxvi, 36-46; John xviii, 1; xii, 27.

²⁹ Acts xii, 2.

³⁰ Ὁ Μικρός, *the Little*, not *the Less*, as in the A. V., Mark xv, 40.

³¹ Matt. xxvii, 56, Μαρία ἡ τοῦ Ἰακώβου καὶ Ἰωσή μῆτηρ.

³² Mark xvi, 1; comp. xv, 40; Luke xxiii, 55, 56; xxiv, 1.

also named Alphæus;³³ but this is seriously questioned. Though a man of prominence in the primitive Church, he does not seem to have been one of the twelve apostles.

James the son of Alphæus, who was one of the original Twelve, and is named in the four apostolic lists.³⁴

James, the Lord's brother, was the eldest of Joseph and Mary's children, Jesus being the firstborn of the Virgin. In the family list contained in the Gospels, the name of James is invariably mentioned first, denoting priority as to his brothers and unnamed sisters.³⁵

§ 231. The
Lord's
Brother.

It is a curious circumstance noted by the Evangelist that Christ's nearest kindred at first did not believe on him as the Messiah when engaging in his Messianic work. Upon the contrary, they regarded his claims thereto as merely so much evidence that Jesus was beside himself.³⁶ Quite probably the Lord referred to this fact when he said: "A prophet is not without honor, but in his own country, and *among his own kin, and in his own house.*"³⁷

This James is not mentioned in the four registries of the twelve disciples,³⁸ but appears to have become converted upon first seeing the risen Christ. In the records of the Lord's reappearances alive, no details are given as to his appearing to James, but the fact itself is clearly stated by Paul: "After that he was seen of James, then of all the apostles."³⁹ Subsequently Paul, relating his visit to Jerusalem, recognizes the Lord's brother as an apostle, and holding a pre-eminent position in the Apostolic Church: "But other of the apostles saw I none save James the Lord's brother."⁴⁰ "And when James, Cephas, and John, who seemed to be pillars [in the Church], perceived the grace that was given unto me, they gave to me

³³ John xix, 25; comp. Matt. x, 3.

³⁴ Matt. x, 3; Mark iii, 13-19; Luke vi, 14-16; Acts i, 13.

³⁵ Matt. xiii, 55, 56; Mark vi, 3; John vi, 42.

³⁶ Mark iii, 21; Matt. xii, 46-50; John vii, 5.

³⁷ Mark vi, 3, 4; Luke iv, 24.

³⁸ Matt. x, 2; Mark iii, 14-19; Luke vi, 13-16; Acts i, 13.

³⁹ 1 Cor. xv, 7.

⁴⁰ Gal, i, 19; ii, 9.

and Barnabas the right hands of fellowship, that we should go unto the heathen, and they unto the circumcision.”⁴¹ James appears to have taken front rank with the apostles; for he was chosen as the first Bishop of Jerusalem;⁴² he was the presiding spirit in the first Council of the Church;⁴³ and he wrote an Epistle of the New Testament which bears his name and indicates his relationship to Jesus. How faithful he was after his conversion to Christ, how spiritual he was in his character and life; and how he finally won a martyr’s crown, are things to be related in the testimonies to follow.

The pre-eminent position of this James as given in the New Testament justifies a reference to his character as indicated in the views of him entertained by those who lived in his times and succeeding. There are two sources, Jewish and Christian.

§232. Character of the Lord’s Brother.

The Talmud: “James was so eminent among the Jews that they designated him to be a mighty man [or, a leader of the people]; and he wore a white garment, and drank no wine, and ate no meat, and never cut his hair, nor did he trim his beard.”

Hegesippus, a Christian historian, who wrote about A. D. 170, is cited by Eusebius thus:

“Hegesippus also, who flourished nearest the days of the apostles, in the Fifth Book of his Commentaries gives the most accurate account of him [*i. e.*, of James the Just] thus: ‘But James, the brother of the Lord, who, as there were many of this name, was surnamed the Just by all, from the days of our Lord until now, receiving the government of the Church with the apostles. This apostle was consecrated from his mother’s womb. He drank neither wine nor fermented liquors, and abstained from animal food. A razor never came upon his head. . . . He alone was allowed to enter the sanctuary [of the priests]. He never wore woolen, but linen garments. He was in the habit of entering the temple alone, and was often found upon his bended knees, and interceding for the forgiveness of his people; so that his knees became as hard as camels’, in consequence of his habitual supplication and kneeling before God. And indeed, on account of his exceeding great piety, he was called the Just.’”⁴⁴

⁴¹ Gal. ii, 9.

⁴² Euseb. *E. H.*, B. ii, c. 1.

⁴³ Acts xv, 13.

⁴⁴ Euseb. *E. H.*, B. ii, c. 23.

Clement of Rome, the companion of Paul, in the sixth book of the *Institutions*, attributed to him, says :

Peter, James, and John, after the ascension of our Savior, though they had been preferred by our Lord, did not contend for the honor, but chose James the Just as Bishop of Jerusalem. . . . The Lord imparted the gift of knowledge to James the Just, to John and Peter, after his resurrection; these delivered it to the rest, and they to the Seventy, of whom Barnabas was one.”⁴⁵

In the *Constitutions of the Apostles*, Clement gives the following declaration as being official from James the Lord's brother :

“I James, the brother of Christ according to the flesh, but his servant as the only begotten of God, and the one appointed Bishop of Jerusalem,”⁴⁶ etc.

Eusebius says :

“James being the first that received the dignity of the episcopate at Jerusalem from the Savior himself, as the sacred Scriptures show that he was generally called the brother of Christ.”⁴⁷

Dr. Philip Schaff, having cited some legendary works relating to the Lord's brother, says :

“Legends gather around the memory of great men, and reveal the deep impression they made upon their friends and followers. The character which shines through these James-legends is that of a loyal, zealous, devout, consistent Hebrew Christian, who, by his personal purity and holiness, secured the reverence and affection of all around him.”⁴⁸

§ 233 Martyr-
dom of the
Lord's Brother. Josephus, referring to the year A. D. 63 as the date of James's death, mentions the Roman procurator of Judæa as

“Festus [who] was now dead, and [his successor] Albinus was but upon the road [from Rome to Jerusalem to take his place]; so he [Ananus] assembled the Sanhedrin of Judges, and brought before them the brother of Jesus who was called Christ, whose name was James, and some others [companions]; and when he had formed an accusation against them as breakers of the law, he delivered them to be stoned.

⁴⁵ Euseb. E. H. B. ii, c. 1.

⁴⁶ Ante-Nicene Fathers, Vol. VII, B. viii. Constitution of Apostles, c. 35, p. 496.

⁴⁷ Euseb. E. H., B. vii, c. 19.

⁴⁸ Hist. Christ. Church, 1, 268, 269.

. . . Whereupon [after his arrival] Albinus . . . wrote in anger to Ananus, and threatened that he would bring him to punishment for what he had done; upon which King Agrippa [the Second] took the high priesthood from him when he had ruled but three months.”⁴⁹

Clement of Rome: “There were two Jameses; one was called the Just, who was thrown from the wing of the temple, and beaten to death with a fuller’s club; and another, who was beheaded”⁵⁰ in A. D. 44. See Acts xii, 1, 2.

Hegesippus, as cited by Eusebius, narrates that the scribes and Pharisees came to James with very flattering words, and besought him, because of his great influence with the people, to use it in recalling them from their faith in Jesus.

They “placed James upon a wing of the temple, and cried out: ‘O thou just man, whom we all ought to believe, since the people are led astray after Jesus that was crucified, declare unto us, What is the door to Jesus that was crucified?’ And he answered with a loud voice: ‘Why do you ask me respecting Jesus the Son of man? He is now sitting in the heavens on the right hand of Power, and will come on the clouds of heaven.’ Then the people shouted, ‘Hosanna to the son of David.’ Thereupon they cast him down from the temple, saying, ‘Let us stone James the Just!’ As he did not die immediately when cast down, but turning around, he knelt down saying: ‘I entreat thee, O Lord God and Father, forgive them, they know not what they do!’ Thus they were stoning him when one of the priests” interposed, and another brained him while he was praying for them. “Immediately after this Vespasian invaded and took Judæa.” Eusebius here remarks: “Such is the more simple testimony of Hegesippus, in which he fully coincides with Clement.”⁵¹

Eusebius continues: “The Jews, after Paul had appealed unto Cæsar, and he had been sent by Festus to Rome, frustrated by their hope of entrapping him by the snares they had laid, turned themselves against James, the brother of the Lord, to whom the Episcopal seat at Jerusalem was committed by the apostles . . . For Festus about this time died in Judæa, and the province [of Judæa] was without a governor or head. But as to the manner of James’s death, it has been already stated in the words of Clement, that he was thrown from the wing of the temple, and beaten to death with a club.”⁵²

Origen, referring to the prediction of Christ concerning the destruction of Jerusalem, says:

“It is recorded that: ‘When ye see Jerusalem compassed about by armies, then shall ye know that the desolation thereof is nigh.’ But at

⁴⁹ *Ant.* xx, 9, 1.

⁵⁰ *Euseb. E. H.*, B. ii, c. 1.

⁵¹ *Ib.* B, ii, c. 23.

⁵² *Ib.* B. ii, c. 23.

that time there were no armies around Jerusalem, encompassing and inclosing and besieging it. For the siege began in the reign of Nero, and lasted till the government of Vespasian, whose son, Titus, destroyed Jerusalem, as Josephus says, on account of James the Just, brother of Jesus who was called Christ; but in reality, as the truth makes clear, on account of Jesus the Son of God.”⁵³

§234 The
Testimony
Reviewed.

The evidential worth of these testimonies is very considerable in substantiating the historical existence and antiquity of Jesus and James.

1. Whether James was by blood the half-brother of Jesus, and next to him in birth, is not the purpose of this discussion. It is sufficient to prove the historicity of the case that James was in any sense a close relative of Jesus, though “called James, the Lord’s brother.” For it is obvious that if there was no historical Christ, no one could be called the brother of Christ. Josephus names “James, the brother of Jesus who is called Christ.” James, in an episcopal document, designates himself as “James, the brother of Christ according to the flesh.” Paul affirms that he saw at Jerusalem with Peter, “James, the Lord’s brother.” Eusebius mentions “James, the brother of the Lord, who was generally called the brother of Christ.” Clement, who agrees with Hegesippus in all details of his death, calls him “James the Just.” Hegesippus speaks of “James, the brother of the Lord, who was surnamed the Just by all.” Origen, citing Josephus, mentions “James the Just, the brother of Jesus who was called Christ.”

Now, this constant identification and characterization of the same persons, in the current literature of different persons, in different ages, in different countries, these designations can not be accidental coincidents, can not be applied to fictitious personages, can not be unhistorical; for more decisive language could not be used when it was the intention to convey the thought that Jesus and James were brothers by blood, having

⁵³ *Orig. contra Cels.* 11, 13, close, and Luke xxi, 20.

the same mother. *It thus appears that not only Jesus was known as the Man of History, but his family relations were also known and named, herein unmistakably confirming the Evangelists.*

2. The historical antiquity and chronology of the apostolate are also conclusively proved by these testimonies. Two distinct references are made to the death of James, which fix the date of its occurrence quite definitely. Josephus makes express allusion to Ananus the younger, who is said to have illegitimately assumed the high priesthood after the death of the procurator Festus, and then proceeded to instigate the martyrdom of James by stoning. For this procedure he was threatened with punishment by the new procurator on his arrival, and King Agrippa II, who was charged with the temple and its interests, deposed Ananus at the end of three months from his assumption of the priestly robes. There was considerable of an interval in the Roman procuratorship over Judæa, between the ruling of the Jews by Festus who had died, and that of his successor, Albinus, before his arrival. It was during this interval, when the country was without a Roman ruler, that James the Just was slain. This occurred in the year 63,⁵⁴ or soon after. Eusebius mentions the event briefly: "Festus about this time died in Judæa, and the province was without a governor or head," and that already "Paul had appealed to Cæsar." Hegesippus places the date of James's death somewhat later. He says: "Immediately after this [*i. e.* James's death] Vespasian invaded and took Judæa." Now, this invasion actually occurred in the year 67.⁵⁵ The Emperor Nero ordered the invasion and conquest of the Jews. But Nero died in 68, when Vespasian being then in Palestine, and hearing of the emperor's death, the soldiers of his command at once proclaimed Vespasian emperor; whereupon he handed over his military forces to his son Titus.

⁵⁴ Schaff, *Hist. Christ. Ch.* 1, 267.

⁵⁵ *Ib.* 1, 395.

IV. MIRACLES WROUGHT IN CHRIST'S NAME.

The apostles, going before the nations in their high commission from Christ, required miraculous credentials to be successful. The world was a bulwark of idolatries, but-
 § 235. Mira-
 cles in
 Demand. dressed on every side against the invasion of any
 new religion. The religion of a revered ancestry
 dominated and was to be defended at all hazards. A deep
 and persistent prejudice was permanently inwrought by
 tradition and education. But that which made the enterprise
 the more formidable and dangerous was, that idolatry
 was the chosen religion of the Roman Empire, and was
 so incorporated into the constitution and laws of government
 that the very proposition which Christianity had to offer was
 held to be high treason against the State. The established
 policy of the empire, of which the emperor in person was
 chief pontiff, the civil officers of the several provinces
 abroad, the armies and their commanders everywhere, were
 committed against that which they all jealously regarded as a
 criminal invasion of the government. Upon the other hand,
 the Christian religion was without a friend at the court. It
 had not even the sanction of an earlier antiquity to render it
 respectable in their eyes, or the sanctity of an ancestral wor-
 ship to make it acceptable. It had no nation at its back to
 enforce its claims or to protect its subjects. Unlike Moham-
 med's movement, it had neither arms nor armies to invade
 and make conquest of whole communities, or States or nations,
 by force. It had an incomparably better mission; but it
 was purely a mission of peace. Its only method was that of
 persuasion; was an appeal to the personal conscience for con-
 viction in the direction of right doing, and to the resulting
 consciousness of supreme satisfactions in a nobler life. But
 to secure attention at all, anywhere and everywhere, the
 first advocates of the new religion must produce evidence
 of advantages superior to those already possessed. They

must come invested with a divine power, known not only to themselves, but with an ability to make known their supreme claims by supernatural signs and wonders corresponding, in order to obtain a hearing and produce conviction. How could the apostles possibly succeed except they illustrate, in some benevolent way, the exercise of some *supernatural power which belonged to their cause*, and not to themselves? And how could that manifestation of power be made effectual in impression otherwise than in the instantaneous working of miracles in the name of their high authority? Accordingly miracles were at once the credentials of the apostles, commending their mission to the world, and the attestation of the supreme authority and the supernatural religion of Christ in his relation to the world.

A study of the facts associated with the founding of the Christian religion embraces the history of miracles as contained in the New Testament. It is to be specially noted that those wrought by the apostles were wrought in Christ's name, and by the power with which he had invested them.* They expressly disclaimed producing miracles by their own power. They were wrought in the direction of beneficence. Jesus had carefully prepared their minds for this responsibility when he said to them: "He that believeth on me, the works that I do shall he do also, and greater works than these shall he do."⁵⁶ To this end, he charged them to tarry in Jerusalem until they received the investiture of power, having the promise that the Holy Spirit should come upon them, and then would they be qualified to bear witness for him unto the uttermost parts of the earth.⁵⁷

Sometimes these miracles are recorded in general terms,

§ 236 Miracles
in Christ's
Name.

*See § 143. γ). As the general subject of miracles has been already traversed in three prior chapters of this work, only those which were peculiarly the apostles' will be considered here.

⁵⁶John xiv, 12.

⁵⁷Luke xxiv, 49; Acts, i, 4, 8.

and sometimes they are ascribed to individual apostles named. Sometimes the account of a given miracle embraces specific details and sometimes very many miracles are massed in one § 237. Miracles general statement. After the pentecostal manifold. Manifestations were realized, "many wonders and signs were done by the apostles."⁵⁸ They were wonderful for numbers, and for the insignificance of the means employed.

"Many signs and wonders were wrought among the people, . . . inasmuch that they brought forth the sick into the streets, and laid them on beds and couches, that at least the shadow of Peter passing by, might overshadow some one of them. There came also a multitude from the cities round about Jerusalem, bringing sick folk and them that were vexed with unclean spirits; and they were healed every one."⁵⁹ "And God wrought special miracles by the hands of Paul, so that from his body were brought unto the sick handkerchiefs or aprons; and the diseases departed from them, and the evil spirits went out of them."⁶⁰

"To the Corinthian Church which Paul had planted, he wrote from Macedonia about the year 57: "Truly the signs of the apostle were wrought among you in all patience, by signs and wonders and mighty works."⁶¹

The interesting and valuable fact may here be recalled, that while the enemies of Christianity for the first four centuries did not deny the occurrence of miracles, they admitted wonderful things did happen by the hands of the apostles, which they felt that they must explain. In a word, they endeavored to explain the miracles wrought in their times by ascribing them to magic or sorcery. It is, however, stated by an unknown *Arabic writer*, who seems to have been a philosopher, that, "in the practice of virtue, they [the apostles] surpass the philosophers; . . . in the genuine performance of miracles, they infinitely excel them."⁶² Celsus asserts that "it is by the names of demons and by the use of incantations that the Christians appear to be possessed of [miraculous] power."⁶³ Porphyry calls the

⁵⁸ Acts ii, 43.

⁵⁹ *Ib.* v, 12, 15, 16.

⁶⁰ *Ib.* xix, 11, 12.

⁶¹ 2 Cor. xii, 12.

⁶² See "Galen," in Smith and Wace's *Dict. of Christ. Biography*.

⁶³ *Orig. con. Cels.* i, 6.

apostles "ignorant and indigent men [who], because they had nothing, performed some signs by magical art, which is no great matter, for the magicians in Egypt, and many others, have wrought signs. Let it be granted that the apostles wrought signs."⁶⁴ Julian the emperor wrote that the Christians "have introduced a body of wonderful works, to give it the appearance of truth. . . . Paul also exceeded all jugglers and impostors that ever were."⁶⁵

The Talmud relates that of miracles—

"There is an example in the son of Dama, nephew of R. Ismael, by his sister. When he had been bitten by a serpent, James of Schechania came to heal him. But Rabbi Ismael did not allow it to be done. The son of Dama said to R. Ismael: 'O Rabbi Ismael, my uncle, let me be healed by him. I will allege a text out of the Law which allows it.' But before he had finished all he would say, he expired. Thereupon Ismael pronounced this speech over him: 'Thou art happy, O son of Dama; for thy body has remained pure, and thy soul has gone pure out of it; and thou hast not transgressed the words of thy brethren.'"⁶⁶

The *Talmud of Jerusalem* affirms:

"A child of the son of Rabbi Joses, son of Levi, swallowed a somewhat poisonous. There came a man who pronounced some words to him, in the name of Jesus, . . . and he was healed. And when he was going away, R. Joses said unto him, 'What word did you use?' He answered, such a word. R. Joses said unto him: 'Better had it been for him to die than to hear such a word.' And so it happened; that is, he died at once!"⁶⁷

The first of these two Talmudic testimonies is inserted here as illustrative of the power of the early Christians to work miracles, and no less the gracious design to be a blessing to their Jewish enemies; and upon the other hand, the ungracious and vindictive spirit in which their efforts of love were received, that death was preferred to life saved by a Christian miracle. As nothing is known of the home residence of either James, no opinion can be formed as to which James, if either, is here referred to. In the second case, there is manifested the same old hatred to Jesus Christ, in whose name the miracles were wrought, carried to the same extreme. But thus

⁶⁴ *Lard.* vii, 442.

⁶⁵ *Ib.* 622.

⁶⁶ *Tal. Jerus.* Avoda, Sara 40, d. fol. 27, col. 2, med.

⁶⁷ *Ib.* Tr. *Sabbat. Pugio Fidei*, p. 170.

were they taught, and so did they feel, as furnished by their Rabbis, in the work which they hold as their highest authority, their Talmud.

To these Jewish testimonies may be added that of the modern Jewish historian, Dr. Heinrich Graetz, professor in the University of Breslau, Prussia, who says:

“Christianity, only just born, went forth upon a career of conquest and proselytism. The disciples asserted that Jesus had imparted the power of healing the sick, of awaking the dead, and of casting out evil spirits. With them the practice of exorcism became habitual, and thus the belief in the power of Satan and demons, brought from Galilee, first took form and root. . . . The early Christians used, or rather *misused*, the name of Jesus, for the purposes of incantation . . . Exorcism by degrees became a constant practice among the Christians.”⁶⁸

In corroboration of the foregoing testimonies relating to miraculous power and work on the part of the apostles and § 239. *Origen* their successors, the recorded testimony of *Origen* respecting miracles wrought in his own time *Confirms.* is now due. *Origen* wrote about A. D. 240–245. He says:

“We, if we deem this a matter of importance, can clearly show a countless multitude of Greeks and Barbarians who acknowledge the existence of Jesus. And some give evidence of having received, through this faith, a marvelous power by the cures which they perform, invoking no other name over those who need their help than that of the God of all things, and of Jesus, along with the mention of his history. For by *these means we, too, have seen many persons freed from grievous calamities, and from distractions of mind, and madness, and countless other ills, which could be cured neither by men nor devils.*”⁶⁹

Here are admissions of the miraculous power exercised by the early Christians for curing fatal diseases, “the power of § 240. *Review.* healing the sick, awaking the dead, and casting out demons;” “a constant practice among the Christians” at that time. But in explanation, the adversaries superstitiously attribute these works to “incantation” or to “the belief in the power of Satan.”⁷⁰ The curious question arises, Why this preference as to the source of power? Res-

⁶⁸ *Hist. of the Jews*, Vol. I, p. 170.

⁶⁹ *Orig. contra Cels.* iii, 24.

⁷⁰ *Matt.* ix, 32, 34; xii, 22, 30; *Mark* iii, 22, 30.

cuing the poisoned by a word, "healing the sick, awaking the dead, and casting out demons," are pure miracles in fact, though *called* by any other name. It is the same old charge which Jesus refuted when his opposers ascribed the miracles which he himself wrought to Satan. Miracles were helpful to the ministry of the apostles and their successors in opening the new epoch known as the Christian era; and when they had done their work for the world, they were retired. The evidence of experience and Christian consciousness replaced the external evidence of miracles. This was the deeper, because the internal proof of the Christian religion, precisely where all other religions fail; ultimate, because it was personal, affecting the character and the life of the individual believing in Christ.

V. MINISTRY OF THE APOSTLES TO THE NATIONS.

The student of the New Testament will readily recall Christ's commission intrusted to his apostles: "Go ye therefore and make disciples of all nations." "And they went forth and preached everywhere, the Lord working with them and confirming the word with signs following."⁷¹ It is now in place to observe how the work of the apostolate progressed, and how the doctrines and practice of the Christian religion became diffused abroad among mankind, under the ministry of the apostles and their immediate successors during the first three centuries.

Waiving mere opinions which are not evidential, and crediting the facts conceded touching the rapid spread of Christianity, we begin with Tacitus.

"At first only those were arrested who acknowledged [themselves Christians]. Next, on their information a vast number [of others] were convicted [of being Christians]."⁷² Pliny affirms that "Many of every age, of every rank, and of either sex, are exposed and will be exposed to danger. Nor has the contagion of the superstition been confined to the cities, but it extends to the villages, and even to the [open] country.

⁷¹ Matt. xxviii, 19; πορευθέντες οὖν μαθητεύσατε πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, Mark xvi, 20.

⁷² *Annals*, xv, 44; comp. Matt. xxiv, 9, 10.

§ 241. Ministry of the Apostles to the Nations.

§ 242. The Voice of Disbelief.

The temples had already been deserted and the victims heretofore could hardly find a purchaser. . . . From this it is easy to imagine what a multitude of men might be retained, if pardon should be afforded to those who repent⁷³ [of following Christ].” Lucian exclaims: “Pontus is full of Atheists and Christians!”⁷⁴ Julian writes: “Many of you, it seems, I have offended—in a manner all of you: the Senate, the rich, the people. The greatest part of the people, or rather the whole of them, are offended at me because they love impiety, and they see that I embrace and adhere to the religion of my ancestors.”⁷⁵ “A great multitude of men in the cities of Greece and Italy were seized with this distemper.”⁷⁶ Josephus alleges that “Jesus was a teacher of such as received the truth with gladness. He carried away with him many of the Jews and also of the Greeks.”⁷⁷ *Toledoth Jeshu* concedes that “Israel went after him, and some of them were reputable people who confirmed the doctrine of Jeshu [*i. e.*, Jesus] and declared that they were his messengers; and they gathered unto them a vast multitude of Israel; that the number of his disciples amounted to two thousand; that the belief in him increased more and more for thirty years after his death; that his followers were called Nazarenes; and that the belief in Jesus became strong and spread abroad until they numbered thousands and tens of thousands.”

Clement of Rome says: “Saint Paul preached both in the East and in the West, taught the whole world righteousness, and traveled to the utmost bounds of the West.”⁷⁸ Ignatius of Antioch mentions “bishops that are settled in the farthest parts of the earth.”⁷⁹ Justin Martyr of Palestine says: “There is not a single race of men, whether Barbarians or Greeks, or those dwelling in wagons, or without houses, or such as dwell in tents,⁸⁰ among whom prayers and thanksgiving are not offered to the Father and Creator of all things through the name of the crucified Jesus.”⁸¹ Irenæus of Lyons wrote: “The Church, though dispersed throughout the whole world, even to the ends of the earth, has received from the apostles and their disciples this faith.”⁸² Tertullian of Carthage said: “We are but of yesterday, and we have filled every place among you; [your] cities, islands, fortresses, towns, market-places, the camp, tribes, companies, palace, Senate, Forum: we have left you nothing but the temples of your gods.”⁸³ “The outcry is that the State is filled with Christians; that they are in the fields, in the citadels, in the islands. They [the accusers] make lamentation as for some calamity, that both sexes, every age and condition, even high rank, are passing over to the profession of the Christian faith.”⁸⁴ “For upon whom else

§243. Con-
firmed by
Christians.

⁷³ *Official Epis. to Trajan*. See Append., *Excursus B*.

⁷⁴ *Lard.* vii, 283, 284.

⁷⁵ *Misopogon*, *Ib.* vii, 647.

⁷⁶ *Ib.* 628.

⁷⁷ *Ant.* xviii, 3, 3.

⁷⁸ *Epis. to Cor.* c. 5; comp. *Philipp.* iv, 3.

⁷⁹ *Epis. to Eph.* c. 3.

⁸⁰ Ἀμαξοβλῶν = nomad tribes.

⁸¹ *Dialogue with Tryphon*, c. 117.

⁸² *Heresies*, c. 10, 1.

⁸³ *Apol.* c. 37.

⁸⁴ *Ib.* c. 1.

have the [universal] nations believed but upon the Christ who is already come? For whom have the nations believed: Parthians, Medes, Elamites, and they who inhabit Mesopotamia, Armenia, Phrygia, Cappadocia, and they who dwell in Pontus, and Asia, and Pamphylia, tarriers in Egypt, and inhabitants in the region of Africa which is beyond Cyrene, Romans and sojourners; yes, and in Jerusalem Jews, and all other nations. . . . In all places the name of Christ who is already come reigns, as of him by whom the gates of all cities have been opened, and to whom none are closed, before whom iron bars have been crumbled, and brazen gates opened. . . . In all these places dwell the people of the name of Christ.”⁸⁵ “For if such multitudes of men were to break away from you, and betake themselves to some remote corner of the world, why, the very loss of so many citizens . . . would cover the empire with shame; nay, in the very forsaking, vengeance would be inflicted. Why, you would be horror-stricken at the solitude in which you would find yourselves at such all-prevailing silence, and that stupor as of a dead world. You would have to seek subjects to govern. You would have more enemies than citizens remaining. For now it is the immense number of Christians which makes our enemies so few; almost all the inhabitants of your various cities being followers of Christ.”⁸⁶

Origen of Alexandria shall speak the final word on the success of the Gospel up to his time. Writing a little more than two centuries after the crucifixion, this eminent and learned apologist said:

“Any one who examines will see that Jesus attempted and successfully accomplished works beyond the reach of human power. For although, from the very beginning, all things opposed the spread of his doctrine in the world, both the princes of the times, and their chief captains and generals, and all—to speak generally—who were possessed of the smallest influence; and in addition to these, the rulers of the different cities, and the soldiers, and the people; yet it proved victorious, as being the WORD OF GOD, the nature of which is such that it can not be hindered; and becoming more powerful than all such adversaries, it made itself master of the whole of Greece, and a considerable portion of barbarian lands, and converted countless souls to his religion.”⁸⁷ “But the God who sent Jesus, dissipated all the conspiracies of the demons, and made the Gospel of Jesus to prevail throughout the whole world, for the conversion and reformation of men; and caused the Churches to be everywhere established in opposition to those of superstition and licentiousness and wicked men; for such is the character of the multitudes who constitute the citizens in the assemblies of various cities; . . . for who would not admit that even the inferior members of the Church, and those who in comparison with the better

⁸⁵ *Ans. to Jews*, c. 7.
22

⁸⁶ *Apol.* c. 37.

⁸⁷ *Contra. Cels.* 1, 27.

are less worthy, are nevertheless more excellent than many of those who belong to the assemblies in different districts?"⁸⁸ "Christians do not neglect, so far as in them lies, to take measures to disseminate their doctrine throughout the whole world. Some of them accordingly have made it their business to itinerate, not only through cities, but even villages and country houses, that they might make converts to God." "At the present day, indeed, when, owing to the multitude of Christian believers, not only rich men, but persons of rank and delicate and high-born ladies receive the teachings of Christianity."⁸⁹

In the temporal sense, the success of Christianity culminated when it had effected a conquest over the idolatrous system which had been incorporated into the government of Rome, when all oppositions and persecutions were disallowed by law, and when Christianity had itself become the established religion of the State, under Constantine the Great. This, however, did not all come to pass suddenly, but was the progressive development of some years. Although Constantine did not identify himself personally with the Christian Church until just prior to his death in 337, he issued several imperial decrees which led up to the adoption of the Christian religion by the empire. The first Edict of Toleration was issued in A. D. 311, which put an end to persecutions. The second Edict of Toleration was issued in 313, which was preparative for legal protection and final recognition. The Nicene Council assembled in 325, over which the emperor presided in person; a Council which has been properly designated "the solemn inauguration of the Imperial State-Church."⁹⁰

"In 312, Constantine, in conjunction with his Eastern colleague, Licinius, had published an Edict of Religious Toleration not now extant. . . . In January, 313, the two emperors issued from Milan a new Edict (the third) on religion, still extant, both in Latin and Greek, in which in the spirit of religious eclecticism they granted full freedom of all existing forms of worship with special reference to the Christian. This religion the Edict not only recognized in its existing limits, but also—what neither the first nor perhaps the second had done—allowed every heathen subject to adopt with impunity. At the same time the

⁸⁸ *Contra. Cels.* iii, 29, ⁸⁹ *Ib.* iii, 9.

⁹⁰ See Schaff, *Hist. Christ. Church*, Vol. II; Preface, p. v.

church buildings and property, [previously] confiscated in the Diocletian persecution, were ordered to be restored, and private property owners to be indemnified from the imperial treasury." In March, 313, "he exempted the Christian clergy from military and municipal duty; abolished various customs and ordinances offensive to Christians in 315; facilitated the emancipation of Christian slaves [before 316]; legalized bequests to Catholic Churches in 321; . . . contributed liberally to building churches and the support of the clergy; erased the heathen symbols of Jupiter and Apollo, Mars and Hercules, from imperial coins (323); and gave his sons a Christian education. . . . The emperor now issued a general exhortation to his subjects to embrace the Christian religion, still leaving them, however, to their own conviction, . . . in 324."

"The first Edict of Toleration, A. D. 311, made an end of persecution; the second Edict of Toleration, 313, prepared the way for legal recognition and protection; the Nicene Council, 325, marks the solemn inauguration of the Imperial State-Church.⁹¹

Such was the progress and the success of Christianity which attended the apostles' preaching Christ's Gospel to the nations. What account, then, do the historical Scriptures of the New Testament give of the apostles' ministry and miracles, which history records as opening such a new and amazing era to the world? First, on the day of Pentecost at Jerusalem, which dates the occasion of their first investiture of power and spiritual coronation, the apostles stood up before the vast multitudes assembled, and received from heaven each a flaming crown.⁹² The fruit of their first day's labor for Christ and Christianity, at the metropolis of the Jews, was three thousand souls.⁹³ A few days later, "a notable miracle" was wrought—the first distinctively known by the apostles—and five thousand converts were added to the Church.⁹⁴ Then "a great company of priests became obedient to the faith;"⁹⁵ after that, "believers were added to the Church, multitudes of both men and women;"⁹⁶ then there were "myriads"⁹⁷ of Jews who gladly accepted the Christian doctrine and life. The jealousy of the Jews, however, now found its expression in persecutions vehement and

§ 245. The
Scriptural
Account.

⁹¹ *Hist. Christ. Church*, Vol. iii, 29-32; Preface to Vol. II, p. 1. ⁹² Acts ii, 3, etc.

⁹³ *Ib.* ii, 41. ⁹⁴ *Ib.* iv, 4. ⁹⁵ *Ib.* vi, 7. ⁹⁶ *Ib.* v, 14. ⁹⁷ *Μυριάδες*, *Ib.* xxi, 20.

fierce, and full of fanaticism. They seized some of the Twelve and imprisoned them;⁹⁸ they beat and threatened them.⁹⁹ Herod Agrippa I, having arrested Peter, and James, the brother of John, intended to have them slain. James was beheaded, Peter was incarcerated, but found deliverance through the interposition of an angel.¹⁰⁰ Stephen was stoned to death.¹⁰¹ Saul of Tarsus "made havoc of the Church," and continued "breathing out threatenings and slaughter."¹⁰² At length the apostles of the Lord, as he had enjoined upon them scattered, abroad to other cities and nations, but continued their preaching and miracles as they went.

Very soon the city of Antioch, in Syria, became the great center of the Gentile Christians, as Jerusalem had been the great center of the Jewish Christians. From this geographical point, Paul, Barnabas, and Silas planned and executed extensive missionary journeys abroad in the interests of Christianity and humanity. They traversed the Roman provinces embraced in Asia Minor, and along the coast of Eastern Europe, organizing mission stations in the various communities, civilizations, and States, and in the larger centers and capitals, offering the salvation of the gospel first to the Jews, and afterwards to the Gentiles. And wherever they went many souls were won to the Lord. To this end, they traversed lands, and seas, and islands, publishing Christ's name and love.

They touched at cities made forever famous in classic story, announcing the glad tidings of a Savior come, who was "the Desire of Nations." There were "Mitylene, the beautiful;" Chios, the birthplace of Homer; Samos, where Æsop, the immortal fabulist, first opened his eyes upon the world; Miletus, the home of Thales, one of the seven wise men of Greece; Athens, the seat of learning and culture before the world, "the very eye of Greece," where Euclid wrought out his geometric propositions; where Demosthenes thundered

⁹⁸ Acts iv, 3.

¹⁰¹ *Ib.* vii, 58.

⁹⁹ *Ib.* v, 40; iv, 17, 18.

¹⁰² *Ib.* viii, 1-3; ix, 1.

¹⁰⁰ *Ib.* v, xii.

forth his eloquence against Philip; where the genius of Phidias and Praxiteles and Alcamedes embodied their fame in the beautiful arts on marbles, as enduring as time. There were Macedonia, where Aristotle was born; and Philippi, where Augustus and Mark Antony triumphed in battle over Brutus and Cassius; and Actium, where Antony and Cleopatra conjointly were defeated by Octavius; and Ephesus, where Alexander the Great proffered all his spoils of war in Asia for the privilege of carving his own name upon the great temple of Diana, "one of the Seven Wonders of the World." Then, there were Egypt, the university of the nations, and its vast Alexandrian library; Italy, wherein centered the great military power which ruled the world; where Cicero spoke in his charming eloquence; where Sallust and Livy, Horace and Ovid and Virgil thought, or wrote, or sung. And there was old Rome itself, the world-capital, in which the first pagan persecutions began under Nero, and near which they also ended. These capitals and cities, among others, were captured soon by the Prince of Peace, and in turn became centers of the new and Christly influence. How effectual was the work may be best understood by the Jews' outcry in opposition at Thessalonica: "These that have turned the world upside down are come hither also." Meantime, Tacitus at Rome, the greatest of Roman historians, records that the Christian religion, though suppressed for a brief time, was that "pernicious superstition which had burst forth again," and spread from Judæa to the capital of the empire, and that "a vast multitude" were convicted of the crime of being Christians! And the younger Pliny, entering upon the government of Pontus and Bithynia, reports to the emperor that "the contagion of the superstition" had spread through the cities and the land, so that "many of every age and every rank, and of either sex, were exposed to the danger" of the inflictions of persecutors.

Meantime, Christianity was bitterly opposed by several schools of philosophy—the Cynics, the Epicureans, the Neo-Platonists, and the Eclectics—as if by a coalition. The literature of the day assailed the Christian religion. Celsus, of the Epicurean or Eclectic school, taking counsel of his prejudices and of the Jews' malice, wrote a treatise to break the power of Christ, whom he did not hesitate to call "an impostor," verifying and vindicating the predictive statement of the devout and just Simeon: "Behold, this Child is set for the falling and the rising of many in Israel, and for a sign that will be spoken against." Lucian, his contemporary, the universal infidel respecting all religions, wasted his impotent scorn on the poor Christians, calling their religion "the latest folly in the world's great madhouse." Julian the Emperor, known as the "Apostate," acknowledged that the Senate, the rich, aye, "the greatest part of the people, or rather the whole of them, were in love with impiety," for rejecting and condemning the monstrous fraud of the pagan gods elected by the State; and he affirms that "a great multitude of men in Greece and Italy were seized with this [mental] distemper." The rabbinical work called *Toledoth Jeshu* admits that the Christian converts within thirty years of Christ's crucifixion, "became strong, and spread abroad until they numbered thousands and tens of thousands." These are the witness of *foes* outside the Christian world. In confirmation of their testimony is that of *Clement and Ignatius, of Justin and Irenæus, and of Tertullian and Origen*, who enter into the minutæ of the Christian life, as known from the interior standpoint of ancient Christendom.

And with what forces in the field did Christianity meet this coalition of its adversaries from the seats of literature and philosophy? Without arsenals or armies, without friends or wealth or influence, it opposed the sanctity of ancestral religions, the prejudice of contempt for a "new" worship, which

§ 246. Obstacles and Oppositions.

had for its object an unseen and "unknown God," and the constant presence and demands of Roman law and imperial armies which stood across its path of progress. Yet it did more than win hearts by the multitude; it destroyed the images of the heathen gods, and overthrew the altars dedicated to them. It swept away the religious systems of ancient paganism, born of a degenerate human nature, full of degrading superstitions and depraving sensualities—systems which had required whole generations and ages to grow into form, and incorporate into laws, and organize into institutions of the State. It caused the sacred temples, which had become dimmed and hoary with the sanctity and services of past antiquities, to be vacated by their votaries, and abandoned to be the abode of the bat and the midnight owl. Within three centuries of the crucifixion it had won its way by virtue of its intrinsic worth, permeating whole populations of the continents, and so changing the course of history that, when Constantine came to the throne as the sole ruler of the empire, the world was prepared for the great change to come, and, seizing the diadem of the Cæsars, placed it upon the imperial brow of this follower of the lowly Nazarene—the first Christian emperor. That old government which was once the synonym for power, with its horrible dungeons and tortures, its stakes and crosses wherewith to punish the Christians, has long since gone down to the dust and perished from before the eyes of men. But from its ancient ruins there have risen unto Jesus, the once despised, crucified One, but now "the King, eternal, immortal, invisible, the only wise God," "a dominion, and a glory, and a kingdom, that all people and nations and languages should serve him; his dominion is an everlasting dominion which shall not pass away, and his kingdom shall not be destroyed."

"The gospel, preached by men without name, without study, without eloquence, cruelly persecuted, and destitute of all human support, did not fail to get established in a short time throughout the whole world. It is a fact which nobody can deny, and a fact which proves that the work was of God."

INDUCTIONS.

1. Christianity possesses an Historical Monument in the Name of its great Founder.
2. Christ's apostles are accorded a place in history even by his worst adversaries.
3. Success among the nations was ever secured by Divine Truth, attested by miracles.
4. Permanency was insured by the power of conscious experience and life in believers.

CHAPTER XIII.

THE PERSECUTIONS OF THE PRIMITIVE CHRISTIANS.

I. HEATHEN OPINIONS OF CHRISTIANS AND CHRISTIANITY.

- a) *Opinions reflected by Epictetus, Tacitus, Pliny, Suetonius, Antoninus, Galen, Porphyry, and Julian.*
- β) *Watchwords given the Christians by the Apostle Paul.*

II. PRIMITIVE CHRISTIANS BLAMELESS IN CHARACTER.

- a) *Affirmations by Adversaries: Pliny, Lucian, Julian, and an Arabian.*
- β) *Confirmation by Adherents: Aristides, Apollonius, and Didachè.*

III. PREDICTION OF PERSECUTIONS UTTERED BY CHRIST.

- 1. *Jewish Persecutions.*
- 2. *Roman Persecutions.*
 - a. *Literary Persecutions.*
 - b. *Imperial Persecutions.*
 - c. *Roman Punishments.*

IV. OCCASION FOR THE PERSECUTION OF THE CHRISTIANS.

- a) *Witness of the Persecutors.*
- β) *Graffiti in Caricature of Christ.*

V. VOICE OF MODERN HISTORIANS RESPECTING EARLY PERSECUTIONS.

Edward Gibbon, Thomas Arnold, Wm. E. H. Lecky, Philip Schaff, McClintock and Strong.

A GENERAL SURVEY OF THE SITUATION.

- a) *The Aggressive Character of the Gospel.*
- β) *The Effects of Aggression on the Natural Man.*
- γ) *The Exaltation of the Christians in Suffering.*

INDUCTIONS.

CHAPTER XIII.

THE PERSECUTIONS OF THE PRIMITIVE CHRISTIANS.

§ 247. Sources : Biographical Epitomes, Testimonies and Literature.

1. JUVENAL (A. D. 50-130) was the contemporary of Tacitus and Pliny, the friend of Martial, and lived during the reign of four successive emperors. Moreover, he was the author of sixteen *Satires*, which are still read with much interest by men of letters, as well as by the student of the ancient classics. He evidently refers in his first *Satire* to the sufferings imposed upon the Christians in the reign of Nero, as also described by Tacitus and Suetonius; facts which occurred about thirty years after the crucifixion, of which some have supposed Juvenal to have been an eye-witness. Alluding to a wretch who was a minister and minion of Nero, Juvenal wrote :

“Pone Tigellinum, tæda lucebis in
Qua stantes ardent, qui fixo gutture fumant,
Et latum media sulcum deducit arena.”—*Sat.* lib. i, 255-157.

2. MARTIAL (A. D. 95) a Latin epigrammatist of celebrity, the author of twelve books which have come down to us. He was of Spanish blood, born in the reign of the Emperor Claudius, in the year 48, and died near the same place in 104. He is mentioned by Pliny junior, as the intimate friend of Juvenal, and he was the favorite of several emperors under whose reign he lived. Coming to Rome at the age of twenty-three, when Nero was on the throne, he had ample opportunities to acquaint himself with the emperor's methods of persecution of the Christians, and was undoubtedly an eye-witness of the great conflagration of the capital in the year 54, and all the wicked cruelties which Nero practiced upon the resident Christians of Rome. One of Martial's epigrams is based upon Nero's tortures of the Christians inflicted upon his innocent subjects, to gratify “the ferocity of one man.” He says :

“In matutina nuper spectatus arena,
Mucius, imposuit, qui sua membra focis,

Si patiens fortisque tibi durusque videtur,
 Abderitanæ pectora plebis habes.
 Nam, cum dicatur, tunica præsentē molesta,
 Urn manum, plus est dicere; non facio."

25.

—Lib. x, Epigr.

3. LUCIUS ANNEUS SENECA (65) was a Stoic philosopher and the teacher of Nero. He was a rhetorician of fame, the contemporary of the Apostle Paul. Retiring from public life, he offered his ample fortune to the emperor, who declined to receive it, and having incurred Nero's suspicion, Seneca, in his old age, was ordered by his former pupil, Nero, to commit suicide, which he proceeded to do at once. He was a spectator of the burning of Rome in the year 64, and probably witnessed the sufferings of the Christians for his own guilt in ordering the city to be burned. Seneca describes the cruelest appliances in vogue with the Roman Government to impose slow tortures, and finally death, upon supposed criminals.
4. EPISTLE TO DIOGNETUS (date A. D. 100-150) is a document supposed to have been addressed to a heathen philosopher of note and culture. An early teacher of the Emperor Marcus Aurelius bore the name Diognetus, who was a Stoic philosopher. The language and style of the Epistle would indicate an Alexandrian origin and authorship; but the hypothesis that this Diognetus was the tutor of Aurelius, places its composition at Rome. Possibly its author was Pantænus, the head of the Alexandrian Theological School and the tutor of Clement of Alexandria. In chapter xi of this document the writer claims to have been ἀποστόλων μαθητής "a disciple of the apostles," who had "become a teacher of the Gentiles." Bishop Lightfoot speaks of this letter as "one of the most impressive of the early Christian Apologists in style and treatment," "the simplicity in the mode of stating theological truth, and the absence of all reference to the manifold heresies of the earlier time," point to the middle of the second century as the proper date of this Epistle. (See Bishop Lightfoot's *Apostl. Fathers*, 488.) Dr. Schaff, however, suggests that the time of its composition was "rather earlier than later than this date." (*Hist. Christ. Church*, ii, 702.)
5. APOLLONIUS (d. 185) was an eminent Christian Apologist when Commodus was upon the throne. Christianity, stigmatized at that time as "the new religion," because having neither ancestral traditions from antiquity to command Roman respect, nor identification with a nation to yield it prestige in standing, was condemned by the Senate to be exterminated. Eusebius mentions "Apollonius, one of the faithful of that day, renowned for his learning and wisdom," who was led to the tribunal. "But this most approved and

divinely-favored martyr, as the judge [Perennis] earnestly desired and entreated him to give an account of himself before the Senate, delivered a most eloquent defense of the faith for which he was suffering, in the presence of all, and terminated his life by decapitation, according to the decree of the Senate." (*E. H. B. V.* c. 21.) At his execution the magistrate said: "I would fain let thee go, but can not because of the decree of the Senate; yet with benevolence I pronounce sentence on thee;" and he ordered him to be beheaded with the sword." (Conybeare in *Monuments of Christianity*, p. 48.)

6. THOMAS ARNOLD (1795-1842) was an eminent English historian, teacher, and divine. Graduated at Oxford in 1814, he became "Head Master of Rugby School," and managed its affairs with pre-eminent success. In 1838-1842 he issued his best work on the *History of Rome* (3 vols.; incomplete). "His chief excellence lay . . . in analyzing laws, parties, and institutions." (Stanley.) In 1841, he was made Regius Professor of Modern History in Oxford University. He was father of Matthew Arnold, the poet, and William D. Arnold. He was a high-toned Christian gentleman.
7. EPICETUS (109) was an Eclectic philosopher, born about the middle of the first century. He was at first a slave, then a freedman; he began his philosophic teachings at Rome, was expelled from the city by order of the Senate before the year 90, in the reign of Domitian. His manner of life is described as exceedingly eccentric; he was naked, penniless, wifeless, childless; without a want or a wish, without passion or temper, independent, imperturbable, indifferent to life or death. Epictetus nowhere designates Christianity by that name, but he does mention *the Galileans* as those who evinced no fear of death by martyrdom; a fortitude which was so much superior to his own philosophy that he attributes it to "madness" of mind.
8. HEINRICH E. G. PAULUS (1761-1851) was born at Würtemberg, studied theology and Oriental languages at Tübingen, Göttingen, London, and Paris; was chosen professor at Jena, and in Heidelberg in 1811. He became a prominent rationalist in theology in respect to history and criticism, and adopted some strange and extravagant views, especially in regard to Christ's miracles. Notwithstanding his acute skill, his great learning, and large experience in historical exposition, he was so mentally perverted by his preconceptions of Christianity, which he adopted to fit his views, that he severely taxed the credulity of his readers far more to accept his extravagant theories than was called for to believe the simple and obvious story of miracles in the Gospels. His *Life of Jesus* (1828) and his *Commentary on the New Testament* (Vol. IV, 1800-1807) were his chief works.

9. **GALEN—CLAUDIUS GALENUS** (130–200) was born at Pergamus, Asia Minor. He was a physician of great celebrity, was twice called for professional services in the imperial household of Aurelius and Verus, as he was without a peer in his profession. He exerted a powerful influence upon the whole medical profession for a period of thirteen hundred years.

§ 248. The Persecution of the Christians.

The rules of the highest living are the Gospels of Christ.—**EDMUND BURKE.**

Of all systems of morality, none appears so pure to me as that of Jesus.—**JEFFERSON.**

It was inevitable that the preaching of the new sect, even while they were disseminated with much reserve, should revive the animosities which had accumulated against its Founder, and had ultimately resulted in his death.—**RÉNAN.**

It was to sustain the deliberate and systematic attack of the temporal power, arming in almost every part of the empire in defense of the ancient Polytheism.—**MILMAN.**

It was the greatest absurdity that can be conceived for any to impose on others a worship contrary to their conscience, or deny to men the liberty to choose their own religion. It is not religion, but a love of power, that makes men persecutors.—**LACTANTIUS.**

The whole body of Christians unanimously refused to hold any communion with the gods of Rome, of the empire, and of mankind. It was in vain that the oppressed believer asserted the inalienable rights of conscience and private judgment.—**EDWARD GIBBON.**

And ye shall be hated of all men for my Name's sake.—**JESUS.**

Διωκόμενοι, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐγκαταλειπόμενοι, καταβαλλόμενοι, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἀπολλύμενοι =
 "Persecuted, but not forsaken; cast down, but not destroyed."
 —**PAUL.**

ARGUMENT.

The early Christians were distinguished for their purity and blamelessness of life. Nevertheless, profane writers evidence a common dislike and contempt, even among the better classes of heathen, as regards Christians and the Christian religion. Such misapprehension of character naturally led to open hostility against Christianity. Christ had himself predicted that his followers would have much tribulation. His apostles after him were the first to suffer persecution. Though subjected to terrible cruelties and outrages on account of their faith in Christ, the apostolic writers record no complaints or bitterness on this account. While deploring that any believer should suffer for any given crime, yet to suffer as a Christian was a ground for glorying.

The persecutions of the Christians by Jews and Gentiles

were manifold in number and terrible in experience. They suffered by imperial decrees, but especially by Sanhedrists and by provincial governors. The ungovernable malice and fanaticism of the Jews against Jesus was transferred to his followers. When mere reasoning was protested as being insufficient for the demands of religion and of our spiritual nature, the philosophers of the day antagonized Christianity. But the chief offense of the Christians consisted in their pronounced opposition to the gods of the State as false, immoral, and degrading. Instead, they introduced a "new religion," which had neither the sanction nor the sanctity of antiquity to commend it, and had no nation behind it to command respect for it or enforce its claims. The Christians persistently refused as an act of worship to burn incense to the statue of an emperor, and declined absolutely to revile the name of Jesus Christ as a test of loyalty to the government. Thereupon the inalienable rights of conscience were outraged by violence and persecution. As the empire, of which the emperor was the high pontiff, had incorporated into its organic structure the exclusive rights of religion, Christianity was imperially denounced, and those who advocated or adhered to the faith were declared to be guilty of high treason.

1. Heathen Opinions of Christians and Christianity.
2. Character of the Primitive Christians Blameless.
3. The Occasion for the Persecution of Christians.

I. HEATHEN OPINIONS.

What the Roman heathen opinions were respecting Christians and the Christian religion is sufficiently reflected in the following testimonies, which have been transmitted to us in their own writings.

§ 249. Opinions of Christians.

Let us take no other than the views entertained by their own representative men.

a) Epictetus wrote (109) respecting the fortitude of Christians who had to brave martyrdom, because they could not and would not worship the false gods chosen by the State, and execrate Christ, as Roman magistrates required:

"Is it possible that a man may arrive at that temper and become indifferent to those things *from madness* or habit as the Galileans* do,

* Suidas, a man of letters, writing in the tenth century, said: "In the time of the Emperor Claudius (41-54) they who before had been called 'Nazarenes' and 'Galileans,' received a new name at Antioch, and were called Christians." See Acts xi, 26.

and yet no one should be able to know by reason or demonstration that God made all things in the world?"¹

β) Tacitus (110), the famous historian, says of the Jews :

"Whatever might be the origin of their religion, it has the advantage of *antiquity*;" but Christianity was "*the deadly superstition*"² [which], repressed for a time, broke out again, not only in Judæa, where the mischief originated, but throughout the city of Rome also, where all things horrible and disgraceful flow from all quarters as a common receptacle, and where they are encouraged."

γ) Pliny, junior, (112), when proconsul of Pontus and Bithynia, in his official report to the Emperor Trajan, expressed his prejudice against the Christian religion in severest terms. After torturing two deaconesses to compel a confession of mere imaginary wrongs in Christian practices, he writes:

"I could discover nothing but a *perverse and extravagant superstition*."³ "There were others also under like *infatuation*, but as they were Roman citizens, I directed them to be sent to the capital." "Nor has *the contagion of the superstition*"⁴ been confined to cities, but has extended to the towns, and even to the open country." "But *the crime* spread as is wont while the prosecutions were going on;" and "whatever the nature of their profession might be, a *stubborn and unyielding obstinacy* certainly deserved punishment [with death]!"⁵

δ) Suetonius (122), the distinguished biographer of the *Twelve Cæsars*, also shared in this unreasonable prejudice; for in his work he is careful to mention "the Christians as a class of men of a *new and deceitful superstition*."⁶

ε) Marcus Aurelius Antoninus (d. about 180), the Stoic philosopher and emperor (161–180), "had no room in his cosmopolitan philanthropy for the purest and most innocent of his subjects, many of whom served in his army." In his reflective moments he wrote:

"What a soul that is which is ready, if at any moment it must be separated from the body, either to be extinguished or dispersed, or to

¹ Ἐπὶ μάλιστα, Lib. 4, c. 7, cited by *Lard.* vii, 88, 89.

² Exitiabilis superstitio, *Annals*, xv, 44.

³ Prava et immodica superstitio.

⁴ Contagio pervagata est . . . pervicacia inflexibilis obstentatio.

⁵ Diffundente se crimine. Epis. x, 97. See App., *Excursus*, B.

⁶ Superstitionis novæ et maleficæ = deceptive; *magical*, with reference to *miracles*. *Nero*, 16.

continue to exist; but [only] so that this readiness [to die] comes from a man's own judgment, not from *mere obstinacy as with the Christians*,⁷ but considerably, and with dignity, and in a way to persuade another without *scenic display*."⁸

ξ) Claudius Galenus ("Galen," 180), a physician of great celebrity and a high authority in the healing art, remarked of those of his profession who refused to be united in faith and practice as physicians: "It is easier to convince the disciples of Moses and Christ than physicians and philosophers who are addicted to particular sects."⁹

η) Porphyry (270), a man famous in the literature of the Roman world, knew so little of Christianity, which yet he despised, that he speaks of—

"Origen as a Greek, being educated in Greek literature, but who went over to the *barbarian temerity*,¹⁰ . . . *living contrary to the laws*." "And now the people wonder that *this distemper*¹¹ has oppressed the city so long, Æsculapius and the other gods no longer conversing with men. For since Jesus has been honored none have received any public benefits from the gods."

θ) Julian the Emperor (361) was not only "an apostate" from the faith, but was bitterly opposed to Christianity, as his own words witness:

"A great multitude of men in the cities of Greece and Italy are seized with *this mental malady*." "By the madness of the Galileans all things were brought to the brink of ruin; and now we are all safe by the goodness of the gods." "I think it right to show to all men the reasons by which I have been convinced that the religion of the Galileans is a human contrivance, badly put together, having nothing in it divine, but abusing the childish, irrational part of the soul which delights in fable. They [the Christians] have introduced a heap of wonderful works to give it the appearance of truth." He mentions "the calamity [which the Christians] brought upon themselves, who, forsaking the immortal gods, betake themselves to dead men." "Shall we, for this, most hate the understanding, or most pity the simple and ignorant

⁷ Κατὰ ψιλὴν παράταξιν = according to naked discipline.

⁸ Ἀτράγωδως = "without noise or fuss." *Medit.* xi, 3.

⁹ De Differentia Pulsuum, lib. ii, p. 22. (See *Lard.* vii, 301.)

¹⁰ Πρὸς τὸ βάρβαρον ἐξώκειλε τὸ λημῆμα = "ran aground respecting the barbarian act of daring," i. e., in rejecting the heathen gods, and resisting the emperor's edict. See *Lard.* vii, 397, and *Euseb. E. H.* vi, 224.

¹¹ Ἡ νόσος = "sickness, disease, distemper."

among you who are so unhappy as to leave the immortal gods and go over to a dead Jew?"¹²

With such preconceptions and misconceptions as to what Christianity is, and what it proposes to do in the interests of mankind; in the utter want of a conception of the spirituality of the Christian religion and of the spiritual satisfaction which it brings to man's spiritual nature, it is easy to see how such men, in their ignorance, should denounce the "new religion" as "a deadly superstition," "a mental malady," "a barbarian temerity;" that absolute loyalty to conviction and conscience should be called "sheer obstinacy," "deserving of punishment" unto death; and that Christian triumph, even in martyrdom, should be regarded as a mere "tragical display" before men! With Julian the fault of the Christians was "madness," as it was with Festus at Cæsarea-on-the-Sea, who exclaimed: "Paul, thou art mad; thy much learning doth turn thee to madness!"¹³

It should not be overlooked that these writers cited were of the foremost men of their period who accused the Christians,—authors, historians, philosophers, proconsul, procurators, emperor. They were not men of the common populace, but men of position and culture, distinguished as leaders of thought, and conspicuous for their influence and activity. Unquestionably such men reflected the views entertained by the common people respecting Christians and Christianity. It was because the Christians refused absolutely to execrate the name of Christ, but, instead, exalted him as the object of their loving adoration, that they were supposed to have been smitten with "madness." Because they withdrew themselves from association with the heathen, who indulged themselves in sinful pleasures and vices, "they were hated of all men" for his sake. Because they would not frequent the heathen temples, and sacrifice to the imaginary and disreputable gods of heathen

¹² See Greek text and transl. in *Lard.* vii, 628, 596, 622, 659, 630.

¹³ Acts xxvi, 24, R. V.

worship, Christians were denounced as "Atheists." To this open charge Justin responds to the government in his defensive address:

"We are called Atheists; and we confess that we are Atheists so far as this sort of gods is concerned; but not with respect to the most true God, the Father of righteousness." "For they proclaim our 'madness' to consist in this: that we give to a crucified man a place second to the unchangeable and eternal God, the Creator of all."¹⁴

As to the fact, the charge was true; but the inference was false that Christians were therefore degenerates. Truly did the skeptical Edward Gibbon assert:

"The whole body of Christians unanimously refuse to hold communion with the gods of Rome, of the empire, and of mankind. *It was in vain that the oppressed believer asserted the inalienable right of conscience and private judgment.*"¹⁵

Of course, it lies in the nature of the case that truth should ever be found antagonistic to error, or it would not be true to itself. That the prevailing prejudice and passion should be aggravated and intensified by the attitude of opposition which Christianity assumed against the pagan religion is perfectly natural and obvious, when we recall the ringing watchwords of the early Christians:

§ 250. Watchwords of the Christians.

"For what fellowship hath righteousness with iniquity? Or what communion hath light with darkness? And what concord hath Christ with Belial? Or what portion hath a believer with an infidel? Or what agreement hath a temple of God with idols?"¹⁶

When, then, these intelligent pagans who were without the knowledge of the truth, saw the religion of their own ancestors disowned and the gods of the State forsaken; a religion which had come down to their possession from antiquity, embraced and revered by their best men in all the honorable ages of the past; a religion which stood allied with the common interests of the society at large, and incorporated into the very structure of the government, supported by all the

¹⁴ *First Apology*, cc. 6 and 13. ¹⁵ Gibbon's *Rome*, 1, 591. ¹⁶ 2 Cor. vi, 14, 15.

military power of the empire, of which religion the emperor was himself chief high priest,—when they saw, in their view, this ancient religion confronted and antagonized by this upstart faith which they regarded as “a deadly superstition,” which was without an antiquity, without an army, without a nation, and without empire, yet so aggressive as to demand the overthrow of everything which had been held by them to be sacred; demanding the downfall of the old faith itself, the destruction of every magnificent temple, the overthrow of every altar, the abolition of every priest, and the abandonment of every service, we need not feel surprised at the profound amazement and disgust entertained by the heathen that found expression in their various epithets: “The new and deceitful superstition” by Suetonius; the “infatuation” and “crime” of the “gentle Pliny;” “the madness” of Epictetus and Julian, and the “barbarian temerity” of Porphyry. Nor is it to be so much wondered at that the Emperor Julian, whose susceptibilities had been so deeply offended, should taunt the Christians of Antioch by saying:

“I suppose you are very happy because you have renounced all kinds of servitude; first to the gods, then to the laws, and lastly to me who am the guardian of the laws.”¹⁷

Nevertheless it was as absurd as it was sincere, that he again wrote:

“You miserable people, at the same time that ye refuse to worship the shield that fell down from Jupiter, and is preserved by us . . . as a certain pledge of the perpetual government of our city, . . . you, who are so very unhappy as to leave the immortal gods and go over to a dead Jew.”¹⁸

II. PRIMITIVE CHRISTIANS BLAMELESS IN CHARACTER.

§ 251. Affirma- That the early Christians exemplified blameless
 tions by lives can not be denied upon the evidence of
 Adversaries. history. This fact could be thoroughly attested
 upon the witness of their enemies who were their contem-

¹⁷ *Mispogon*, cited by *Lard.* vii, 647.

¹⁸ *Id.* vii, 630.

poraries. A few testimonies taken from the many will illustrate the purity and nobility of the primitive Christian character.

1. Pliny: Referring to those who were arrested and brought before his tribunal for punishment, he says:

“They declared that the whole of their guilt or error was that they were accustomed to meet on a stated day before it was light and sing a hymn of praise to Christ as God, to bind themselves by an oath not for the perpetration of any wickedness, but that they would not commit any theft, robbery or adultery, or violate their word, or refuse when called upon to restore anything committed to their trust. After this, they were accustomed to separate, and then reassemble to eat in common a harmless meal. Even this they ceased to do after my edict, in which, agreeable to your commands, I forbade the meeting of secret assemblies.”¹⁹

2. Lucian: “They [the Christians] have a sovereign contempt for all the things of this world, and look upon them as common; and trust one another with them without any particular security.” Referring to one Peregrinus, he adds: “The Christians were much grieved for his imprisonment, and tried all ways to procure his liberty. Not being able to effect that, they did all sorts of kind offices, and that not in a careless manner, but with the greatest assiduity; for even betimes in the morning . . . some of the chief of their men . . . would get into the prison, and stay a whole night there with him. There they had a good supper together, and their sacred discourses.”²⁰

3. Julian: “For it having so happened, I suppose, that the poor were neglected by our priests, the impious Galileans, observing this, have addicted themselves to this kind of humanity; and by the show of such good offices have recommended the worst things. For beginning with love-feasts and ‘the ministry of the tables,’²¹ as they call it—for not only the name, but the thing also is common among them—they have drawn away the faithful to impiety.”²²

4. The unknown Arabic Writer: “We know that the people called Christians founded their religion in parables and miracles. In moral training, we see them in nowise inferior to the philosophers. They practice celibacy, as do many of the women; in diet they are abstemious; in fasting and prayers assiduous; they injure no one. In the practice of virtue they surpass the philosophers; in probity, in continence, in genuine performance of miracles, they infinitely excel them.”²³

5. Aristides: “On this account they do not commit adultery nor fornication; they do not bear false witness; they do not deny a deposit,

¹⁹ *Letter to Trajan.*

²⁰ Cited in *Lard.* vii, 280.

²¹ Acts, vi. 2.

²² *Oration* directing priests, *Lard.* vii, 645, 646.

²³ Smith and Wace's *Dict. of Christ. Biography.*

nor covet that which is not theirs. They honor father and mother; they do good to those who are their neighbors; and when they are judges they judge uprightly, and do not worship idols in the form of man; and whatever they do not wish others should do to them, they do not practice toward any one. And they do not eat the meal of idol sacrifices, for they are undefiled; and those that grieve them, they comfort and make them their friends; and they do good to their enemies. . . . They do not worship strange gods, and they walk in humility and kindness; and falsehood is not found among them, and they love one another; and from the widows they do not turn away their countenance; and they rescue the orphan from him who does him violence; and he who has, gives to him that has not, without grudging; and when they see a stranger, they bring him to their dwelling, and rejoice over him as over a true brother; for they do not call brothers those who are brothers after the flesh, but those who are in the spirit and in God.

“But when any of their poor passes away from the world, and any of them sees him, then he provides for his family according to his ability; and if he hears that any of their number is imprisoned or oppressed for the name of their Messiah, all of them provide for his needs, and if it is possible that he may be delivered, they deliver him. And if there is among them a man that is poor, and they have an abundance of necessaries, they fast two and three days that they may supply the needy with food. And they observe scrupulously the commands of their Messiah; they live honestly and soberly as the Lord their God commanded them. Every morning, and at all hours, on account of the goodness of God toward them, they praise and laud him.”²⁴

6. Apollonius: “We have no part at all in dissolute desires, nor do we allow impure sights, nor a lewd glance, nor an ear that listens to evil, lest our souls be wounded thereby. For he [Jesus] taught us to pacify anger; to moderate desire; to abate and diminish appetite; to put away sorrow; to take part in pity; to increase love; to cast away vainglory; to abstain from taking vengeance, not to be vindictive; to despise death, not indeed out of lawlessness, but as bearing with the lawless; to obey the laws of God; to reverence rulers; to worship God; to intrust the spirit to the immortal God; to look forward to judgment after death; to expect reward after the resurrection to be given by God to those who have lived in piety. Teaching all this by word and deed, along with great firmness, and glorified by all for the benefits which he conferred on them, he [Jesus] was slain at last, as were before him philosophers and just men. For the just are seen to be a cause of offense to the unjust.”²⁵

7. Teachings of the Apostles: “Thou shalt do no murder; thou

²⁴ *Apology* of Aristides.

²⁵ *Apology*, cc. 26, 37, 38; Conybeare's *Monuments of Early Christianity*, 1894.

shalt not commit adultery; thou shalt not corrupt boys; thou shalt not commit fornication; thou shalt not steal; thou shalt not deal in magic; thou shalt do no sorcery; thou shalt not murder a child by abortion, nor kill them when born; thou shalt not covet thy neighbors' goods; thou shalt not perjure thyself; thou shalt not bear false witness; thou shalt not speak evil; thou shalt not cherish a grudge; thou shalt not be double-minded, nor double-tongued, for the double tongue is a snare of death. Thy word shalt not be false or empty, but fulfilled by action. Thou shalt not be avaricious, nor a plunderer, nor a hypocrite, nor ill-tempered, nor proud. Thou shalt not entertain an evil design against thy neighbor. Thou shalt not hate any man; but some thou shalt reprove, and for others thou shalt pray; and others thou shalt love more than thy life."²⁶

The ground already traversed evidences the fact that two classes of religious opinions had appeared in the world, and they were radically opposed to each other. The one was an old system of idolatory, the other was the new system of Christianity. They were in nature mutually antagonistic. In the one case it was insisted that the antiquity of the system, supported as it was by the power of the State, was entitled to the right either to coerce the human conscience or exterminate the Christian subject, because Christianity was an "*unlawful religion*,"²⁷ and the common watchword of the Romans against the Christians was, "*It is not lawful that you should exist*."²⁸ On the other hand, it was claimed, justly, that the rights of conscience for the worship of God were deeply implanted in the human spirit by the Creator, and inhered in him as an inalienable right.²⁹ This issue naturally, if not inevitably, led to private hate on the one part and to open persecution. Nevertheless, it should not be overlooked, that when the adversaries had said the worst they had to say respecting the character and conduct of the Christians, it was a concession that they whom they sought to exterminate for their faith had been living pure and blameless lives. This stands confirmed by the open protests before the magistrates of the government, whose words were a recognized

²⁶ *Didaché*, c. 2.

²⁷ "*Religio illicita*."

²⁸ "*Non licet esse vos*," cited by Tertullian.

²⁹ Acts, iv, 19, 20; xxiii, 1, 2.

challenge for evidence to the contrary of their statements. There yet remain to be considered

III. THE PERSISTENT PERSECUTIONS OF THE CHRISTIANS.

When Jesus founded the Christian religion in the world, he gave utterance to the pathetic prediction that those who would become his disciples must take up their cross and follow him. They must expect that persecutions would await them. He said:

§ 253. Prediction of Persecutions.

“In the world ye have tribulation.”³⁰ “They will lay their hands on you, and will persecute you, delivering you up to the synagogues and prisons; bringing you before kings and governors for my name’s sake. Ye shall be delivered up even by parents and brethren, and kinsfolk and friends; and some of you will they cause to be put to death. And ye shall be hated of all men for my name’s sake.”³¹ “Remember the word that I said unto you: A servant is not greater than his Lord. If they have persecuted me, they will also persecute you.”³²

§ 254. Experience of the Apostles.

How this prediction was realized in the experience of the apostles is related in what follows. Paul says:

“For I think God hath set forth us the apostles last of all, as men doomed to death; for we are made a spectacle unto the world, and to angels, and to men.”³³ “And now, behold, I go bound in the spirit unto Jerusalem, not knowing the things that shall befall me there; save only that the Holy Ghost testifieth unto me in every city, saying that bonds and afflictions abide me. But I hold not my life of any account as dear unto myself, so that I may accomplish my course, and the ministry which I received from the Lord Jesus, to testify the gospel of the grace of God.”³⁴ “In stripes above measure, in prisons more frequent, in deaths oft.”³⁵ “But in all things approving ourselves as the ministers of God, in much patience, in afflictions, in necessities, in distresses, in stripes, in imprisonments, in tumults.”³⁶ “We are troubled on every side, yet not distressed; we are perplexed, but not in despair; persecuted, but not destroyed, . . . for we who live are always delivered unto death for Jesus’ sake.”³⁷ “Yea, and all that will live godly in Christ Jesus will suffer persecution.”³⁸ “When we were with you, we told you before that ye should suffer tribulation, even as it came to pass.”³⁹ “And they [the apostles] departed from the Council, rejoicing that they were counted worthy to suffer dishonor for the Name.”⁴⁰

³⁰ John xvi, 33.

³¹ Luke xxi, 12, 16, 17.

³² John xv, 20.

³³ 1 Cor. iv, 9.

³⁴ Acts xx, 22-24.

³⁵ 2 Cor. xi, 23.

³⁶ *Ib.* vi, 4, 5.

³⁷ *Ib.* iv, 8-10.

³⁸ 2 Tim. iii, 12.

³⁹ 1 Thess. iii, 3, 4.

⁴⁰ Acts v, 41.

Peter adds:

“Beloved, think it not strange concerning the fiery trial among you, which cometh upon you to prove you, as though a strange thing happened unto you; but inasmuch as ye are partakers of Christ’s sufferings, rejoice, that at the revelation of his glory also ye may rejoice with exceeding great joy. If ye are reproached for the name of Christ, blessed are ye, because [the Spirit] of glory and the Spirit of God resteth upon you. For let none of you suffer as a murderer, or as a thief, or as an evil-doer, or as a meddler in other men’s matters; but if any man suffer as a Christian, let him not be ashamed, but let him glorify God in this Name.”⁴¹

These citations sufficiently indicate both the cruelties and persecutions to which the primitive Christians were exposed and subjected, and the tone and trend of their minds in the endurance of these trials. Their noble patience and fortitude, illustrated in their sufferings endured, touched even the heathen multitude with compassion. That they were persecuted exclusively for their faith in Christ is not only corroborated, but particularized and amplified in the testimonies of the heathen themselves, who were men of the highest standing among the heathen.

§255. Fortitude of the Christians.

As the first Christians were Jewish Christians, whose center was Jerusalem, where Jesus was recently crucified, the Jewish people came to regard the Christians, not as a sect of the Jews, but as those who had openly apostatized from the ancient faith of the Church; and accordingly they transferred to the followers of Christ all the hate and malice which ruled when they put him to death. Hence there were

I. JEWISH PERSECUTIONS.

After the destruction of Jerusalem in A. D. 70, the Sanhedrin of the Jews continued its sessions at Jabneh, whose Greek name was Jamnia, called, in the Talmud, Jafna. It was located near the Mediterranean Sea, about eleven miles south of Joppa. The particulars following illustrate the spirit and legislation which prevailed with reference to the Christians, who were odiously

§256. The Talmudic Persecutions.

⁴¹1 Pet. iv, 12-16.

named as identified with the Gentiles. The Sanhedrin passed laws especially placing Christians in the same hateful relations in their regards as the Samaritans,⁴² persecuting them socially, in business relations, and in religion. In Talmudic literature is a Jewish prayer intended to be offered against all Christians, but specially against all Jewish Christians. It was signed by the president of the Sanhedrin, named Gamaliel II. The Jewish Christians were called *Minim*,⁴³ meaning "*Heretics.*" This prayer reads:

"O let the slanderers have no hope! Let the wicked be annihilated speedily, and all the tyrants be cut off quickly! Humble thou them in haste in our days! Blessed art thou, O Lord, who destroyest our enemies!" It was further enjoined: "If the reader of the prayer make a mistake, or become confused in reading, another shall instantly rise up instead, and cry to heaven for a curse upon the Gentiles."⁴⁴

The following details are extracted from the *unexpurgated edition of the Talmud*:

(1.) It is forbidden to buy meat, bread or wine from Jewish Christians, or to eat or drink with them in their own houses; and they shall not have dealings of trust with them.

(2.) The Christian Liturgy is to be put in ban [*i. e.*, condemned under death penalty], like books of magic.

(3.) Every dealer in business, and every service, is strictly forbidden; and also no wonder-cure [miracle-cure] shall be received from them, in which the Christian Jews use the name of Jesus Christ, whether a sick person, or an animal.

(4.) It is strictly forbidden to use any medicine received from Christians, lest it shall convert him [to Christianity].⁴⁵

(5.) A Gentile who employs himself in the law is guilty of death. He is not to employ himself except in the Seven Commandments, which belong to the Gentiles. And thus a Gentile who keeps a Sabbath-day, though it be one of the week-days, if he make it to himself a Sabbath, is guilty of death. . . . But if he employs himself in the law or keeps the Sabbath, or makes an innovation, he is to be beaten and punished, and informed that he is guilty of death; but he is not to be killed."⁴⁶

(6.) A Noahite [*i. e.*, Gentile] who has become a proselyte, and has been circumcised and baptized, and afterwards wishes to return from

⁴² Comp. John viii, 48, and iv, 9. ⁴³ מִיִּיִּם

⁴⁴ *Hilchoth T'phillah*, c. ii, a; and Daily Prayers in Synag., fol. 36, of *Prayer-Book*, Part ii, p. 127.

⁴⁵ *Talmud. Tosifta Chulin*, e. 2, *Avondah Sara*, 17, a; 27, b; *Chulin*, 23, a and b.

⁴⁶ *Hilchoth Melachim*, c. x, 9; *Sanhedr*, fol. 59, col. 1. See also Edersheim's *Jesus the Messiah*, Vol. I, p. 93.

the Lord, and to be only a sojourning proselyte as he was before, is not to be listened to; on the contrary, either let him be an Israelite in everything, or let him be put to death.”⁴⁷

(7.) A Gentile woman is not to be delivered upon the [Jewish] Sabbath-day, not even for payment; neither is the enmity to be regarded. It is not to be done, even if no profanation of the Sabbath is implied.⁴⁸

II. ROMAN PERSECUTIONS.

Among Roman writers of fame who were most active in creating a public sentiment against the Christians, inciting the populace to acts of violence, and instigating the imperial and local government to persecu- § 257. Liter-
tion, were Porphyry, who wrote fifteen books for ary Persecu-
tions.
that purpose, and Hierocles, whom Lactantius mentions as being both “a persecutor, and an adviser of persecution.” Lucian and Celsus were conspicuous for their hostility; the former furnishing in general the ground of opposition, and the latter illustrating the spirit engendered in what is commonly designated “the ten persecutions” of the Christians.

a) Lucian wrote: “These miserable men have no doubt that they shall be immortal and live forever; therefore they contemn death, and many surrender themselves to sufferings. Moreover, their first Law-giver has taught them that they were all brethren when once they had turned and renounced the gods of the Greeks, and worshiped that Master of theirs who was crucified, and engage to live according to his laws.”⁴⁹

β) Celsus wrote: “They must make their choice between two alternatives; if they refuse to render due service to the gods, and to respect those who are set over the service, *let them not come to manhood, or marry wives or have children, or indeed take any share in the affairs of life; but let them depart hence with all speed, and leave no posterity behind them, that such a race may become extinct from the face of the earth.*”⁵⁰

Roman historians testify unequivocally to the open hostility of emperors, led by Nero, who exercised their power to exterminate the Christian religion, or § 258. Impe-
rial Persecu-
tions.
force those who embraced it to become idolaters.

In the year 64, Nero ordered that the city of Rome should be set on fire in order that he might rebuild it with marble in palatial magnificence. To escape the fury of the populace,

⁴⁷ *Hilchoth Melach.* c. x, 3.

⁴⁹ *Lard.* vii, 280.

⁴⁸ *Hil. Melach.* ii, 12.

⁵⁰ *Origen contra Celsum,* viii, 55.

which threatened his life for this outrage on the people and imperial crime against society, he basely attributed his own guilt to the defenseless Christians who were his loyal subjects. He proceeded to inflict the most exquisite tortures upon them as a class, who were entirely innocent, as the following testimonies prove beyond recall. Of this conflagration and the facts cited, we have ample evidence from the writings of several famous historians.

1. Tacitus: "Nero falsely charged the guilt, and punished with the most exquisite torture, the persons . . . commonly called Christians. . . . A vast number were convicted, not so much of the crime of incendiarism as that of hatred of the human race.⁵¹ And in their deaths they were made the subjects of sport; for they were wrapped in the hides of beasts and torn to pieces by dogs, or nailed to crosses, or set on fire, and, when the day declined, were burned alive to serve for nocturnal lights.⁵² Nero offered his own gardens for the spectacle, and also exhibited a chariot on the occasion; and now mingling with the crowd in the dress of a charioteer, now actually holding the reins. *Whence arose a feeling of compassion for the sufferers, though justly held to be odious, because they seemed not to be cut off for the public good, but as the victims of the ferocity of one man.*"⁵³

2. Suetonius: "Moreover, he spared neither the people of Rome, nor the capital of his country. . . . He pretended to be disgusted with the old buildings and the narrow and winding streets; he set the city on fire so openly, that many of consular rank caught his own household servants on their property with tow and torches, but durst not meddle with them. There being near his Golden House some granaries, the site of which he exceedingly coveted, they were battered as if with machines of war, and set on fire, the walls being built of stone. During six days and seven nights this terrible devastation continued, the people being obliged to fly to the tombs and monuments for lodging and shelter. . . . This fire he beheld from a tower in the house of Mæcenas, and being greatly delighted, as he said, with the beautiful effects of the conflagration, he sung a poem on the ruin of Troy, in the tragic dress he used on the stage."⁵⁴ "He likewise inflicted punishments on the Christians, a sort of people who held a new and impious superstition."⁵⁵

⁵¹ "*Odio humani generis*," an ambiguous expression, which Thiersch and others understand to read *the hatred of mankind towards the Christians*.

⁵² The old *Scholias*t contains two interesting passages referring to this circumstance: "In the public shows of Nero, living men were burnt; for he ordered them to be covered with wax that they might give light to the spectators." "He covered certain mischievous men with pitch and paper and wax, and then commanded fire to be applied to them that they might burn."

⁵³ *Annals*, xv, 44.

⁵⁴ *Lives of the Twelve Cæsars*, Nero, c. 38.

⁵⁵ *Ib.* c. 16. *Superstitionis novæ et maleficæ*," the last word referring to witchcraft or enchantment; *i. e.*, Christian miracles.

Speaking of the Emperor Claudius, Suetonius says: "He banished from Rome all the Jews, who were continually making disturbances at the instigation of one Chrestus" [Chrestus = Christus = Christ].⁵⁶

Such were the sufferings inflicted upon the Christians for the crime of being good. Recently an attempt was made to show that the *Annals* of Tacitus are a forgery of one Poggio Bracciolini, an Italian, dating in the § 259. Testimonies Confirmatory.
fifteenth century. But this theory has been thoroughly refuted, and is now abandoned. The genuineness of the work has been substantiated by the agreement of minute details with coins of that date, and inscriptions discovered since that time.⁵⁷ There is also to be added the corroborative testimony of Jerome, who mentions the existence of the *Annals* of Tacitus in his day. But we have the strong confirming testimony of the infidel historian, Edward Gibbon, who indorses the testimony of Tacitus touching the inflictions upon the Christians on account of the burning of Rome, in this language:

a) "The most skeptical criticism is obliged to respect the truth of this extraordinary fact [*i. e.*, the sufferings of the Christians] and the integrity of this celebrated passage of Tacitus. The former [the truth] is confirmed by the diligent and accurate Suetonius, who mentions the punishment which Nero inflicted on the Christians, a sect of men who embraced a 'new and criminal superstition.' The latter [the integrity of the passage] may be proved by the consent of the most ancient manuscripts, by the inimitable character of the style of Tacitus, by the reputation which guarded his text from the interpolations," etc.⁵⁸

β) Sulpicius Severus, an historian of the Christian Church who wrote in elegant style in the fourth century, substantiates again the facts narrated by Tacitus. He says:

"In the meantime the number of the Christians was greatly increased. There happened a fire at Rome while Nero was at Antium; nevertheless, the general opinion of all men casts the blame of the fire upon the emperor [himself]. And it was supposed that his aim therein was that he might have the glory of raising the city again in greater splendor. Nor could he by any means suppress the common rumor that the fire was owing to his orders. He therefore endeavored to cast the

⁵⁶ *Lives of the Twelve Cæsars*, Claudius, c. 25. Hence Paul met Aquila at Corinth, "with his wife Priscilla, because that Claudius had commanded all the Jews to depart from Rome." (Acts xviii, 1, 2.) This also excluded the Christian Jews.

⁵⁷ See *Cyclop. Brit.* under *Tacitus*.

⁵⁸ *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, Millman's (American) ed., Vol. I, 602.

reproach of it upon the Christians. And exquisite tortures were inflicted upon innocent men; and, moreover, new kinds of death were invented. Some were tied up in the skins of wild beasts, that they might be worried to death by dogs. Many were crucified. Others were burned to death, and they were set up as lights in the night-time. This was the beginning of the persecutions of the Christians. *Afterwards the profession of the Christian religion was prohibited by the laws, and edicts were published that no man might be a Christian.* At that time Paul and Peter were condemned to death. The former was beheaded; Peter was crucified.”⁵⁹

γ) Tertullian says: “Consult your histories; you will find that Nero was the first who assailed with the imperial sword the Christian sect, making progress then especially at Rome. But we glory in having our condemnation hallowed by the hostility of such a wretch. For any one who knows him can understand that, not excepting as being of singular excellence, did any thing bring on it Nero’s condemnation.” Christianity “under Nero was ruthlessly condemned; and you may weigh its worth and character, even from the person of its persecutor. If that prince was a pious man, then the Christians are impious; if he was just, if he was pure, then Christians are unjust and impure; if he was not a public enemy, we are enemies of our country. What sort of men we are our prosecutor shows, since he of course punished that which produced hostility to himself.”⁶⁰

δ) *A Monumental Inscription* in Portugal dedicated to Nero furnishes an added interest, as well as a strong confirmation, in regard to the procedures of that emperor against the Christians. The monument celebrates his name on account of his success in clearing that country of two enormous evils, “Robbers and Christians!” A translation of the inscription is this:

TO NERO CLAUDIUS CÆSAR
AUGUSTUS HIGH PRIEST
FOR CLEARING THE PROVINCE
OF ROBBERS, AND THOSE
WHO TAUGHT MANKIND
A NEW SUPERSTITION. *

* NERONI. CL. CAES. AUG. PONT. MAX. OB. PROVINC. LATHRONIB. ET. HIS. QUI. NOVAM. GENERI. HUM. SUPERSTITION. INCOLAB. PURGATAM. This monument no longer exists, but is inserted on the authority of “Ap. Gruter, p. 239.” See Lardner’s Works, vi, 623. Its disappearance could not prove it to be spurious, and a public monument could not possibly be fraudulently imposed upon a given community and civilization without being questioned from the first.

⁵⁹ *Sacred Hist.*, Lib. ii, c. 41, 29. ⁶⁰ *Apology*, c. 5; and *Ad Nationes*, Lib., 1, c. 7.

ε) *Edward Gibbon*, the skeptical historian of Rome, gives his testimony in reference to some of the earlier imperial persecutors of the Christians. He says:

“The *Annals* of the emperors exhibit a strong and various picture of human nature, which we shall vainly seek among the mixed and doubtful characters of modern history. In the conduct of these monarchs we may trace the utmost lines of vice and virtue; the most exalted perfection and the meanest degeneracy of our own species. The Golden Age of Trajan and the Antonines had been preceded by an Age of Iron. It is almost superfluous to enumerate the unworthy successors of Augustus. *Their unparalleled vices, and the splendid theater on which they acted, have saved them from oblivion. The dark and unrelenting Tiberius, the furious Caligula, the feeble Claudius, the profligate and cruel Nero, the beastly Vitellius, and the timid and inhuman Domitian, ARE CONDEMNED TO EVERLASTING INFAMY.* During fourscore years Rome groaned beneath an unremitting tyranny, which exterminated the most ancient families of the Republic, and was fatal to almost every virtue and every talent that arose in that unhappy period.”⁶¹

From his province as proconsul of Pontus and Bithynia, Pliny the younger wrote to the Emperor Trajan for advice referring to his proper treatment of the Christians. Among other particulars contained in this official letter are the following:

§ 260. Persecution Under Caius Pliny.

“I have pursued this course towards those who have been brought before me as *Christians*. I asked them whether they were *Christians*; if they confessed [that they were] I repeated the question the second and a third time, adding threats of punishment. If they still persevered, I ordered them to be led away to punishment; for I could not doubt, whatever the nature of their profession might be, that a stubborn and unyielding obstinacy certainly deserved to be punished [with death]! There were others also under like infatuation. . . . But the *crime* spread, as is wont to happen while the persecutions were going on. . . . An information was presented to me without any name subscribed, accusing a large number of persons who denied that they were *Christians* or ever had been. They repeated after me an invocation of the gods, and with wine and frankincense made supplication to your statue, which I had ordered to be brought in for this purpose, together with the statues of the deities. Moreover, they reviled the name of *Christ*. Whereas those who are truly *Christians*, it is said, can not be forced to do any of these things. I thought, therefore, that they ought to be discharged. Others were named by an informer, who at first confessed themselves *Christians*, but afterwards denied it. The rest affirmed that they had been *Christians*, but they had renounced

⁶¹ *Roman Empire*, i, 130, 131.

their error. . . . They all did homage to your statue and the images of the gods, and at the same time reviled the name of Christ. . . . It is easy to imagine what a multitude of men might be reclaimed, if pardon should be offered to those who *repent [of having been Christians].*"⁶²

THE EMPEROR TRAJAN'S RESCRIPT TO PLINY JUNIOR.

"Trajanus Plinio, S.

"Trajan to Pliny wisheth health and happiness. You have taken the right course, my dear Pliny, in your proceedings with those who have been brought before you as Christians; for it is impossible to establish any one rule that shall hold universally. They are not to be sought for. If any are brought before you, and are convicted [for being Christians] *they ought to be punished.* However, he that denies his being a Christian, and makes it evident in fact—that is, by supplicating to our gods—though he be suspected to have been formerly, let him be pardoned upon repentance. But in no case of any crime whatever, may a bill of information be received without being signed by him who presents it; for that would be a dangerous precedent, and unworthy of my government."⁶³

THE EMPEROR HADRIAN'S* RESCRIPT TO SERENIUS GRANIANUS,

Who was proconsul of Asia, and had written to the emperor: "*It seems to me unjust that the Christians should be put to death only to gratify the clamor of the people, without trial, and without any crime proved against them.*" As Minucius Fundanus, meantime had succeeded to the proconsulship of Granianus, the emperor's Rescript was addressed to him as follows:

"It seems to me that this is an affair which ought not to be passed over without examination if it were only to prevent disturbances being made among the people, and that room may not be left for informers to practice their wicked arts. If, therefore, the people of the province will appear publicly, and in a legal way, charge the Christians, that they may answer for themselves in court, and not proceed [against them] by importunate demands only, and loud clamors, for it is much the better method if any one bring accusations, that you should examine them—if any one shall accuse and bring out anything contrary to the law, do you determine according to the nature of the crime. But, by Hercules! if the charge is only a calumny, do you take care to *punish the author of it with the severity it deserves.*"⁶⁴

§ 263. Persecution of Diocletian. The Emperor Diocletian (284–305), though the son of a slave, proved to be in the main an able and judicious ruler, but he was a man of superstition and a despot. The Coptic Churches of Egypt

* Hadrian was emperor A. D. 117–138.

⁶² See *Excursus F.* for the letter complete.

⁶³ Lib. x, 98.

⁶⁴ Eusebius, *Eccl. Hist.* iv, cc. 8, 9.

and Abyssinia reckon the "Era of Martyrs" as beginning with his reign. Dr. Schaff says:

"In 303, Diocletian issued in rapid succession three edicts, each more severe than its predecessor. Maximian issued the fourth, the worst of all, April 30, 304. Christian churches were to be destroyed; all copies of the Bible were to be burned; all Christians were to be deprived of all public offices and civil rights; and at last, without exception, were to sacrifice to the gods, upon pain of death." "The persecution began on the twenty-third of February, 303, the feast of the *Terminalia* (as if to make an end of the Christian sect), with the destruction of the magnificent church in Nicomedia, and soon spread over the whole Roman Empire, except Gaul, Britain and Spain."⁶⁵

Besides the open confession of persecution by the enemies of Christianity, it is due the suffering victims of their ferocity that they should be heard in their own defense. In his *Dialogue with Trypho the Jew*, the writer says:

§ 264. Apolo-
getic Confir-
mation.

a) Justin Martyr: "These things have happened to you in fairness and justice; for you have slain the Just One and his prophets before him, and you have rejected those who hope in him, . . . cursing in your synagogues those who believe on Christ." "For other nations have not inflicted on us and on Christ this wrong to such an extent as you have, who in very deed are the authors of the prejudice against the Just One and us who hold by him."⁶⁶

β) *Epistle to Diognetus*: "Are not all [the gods] deaf and blind? Are they not soulless, senseless, motionless? Do they not all rot and decay? These things ye call gods; to these ye [heathen] are slaves; these ye worship; and ye end by becoming altogether like them. Therefore ye hate the Christians, because they do not consider these to be gods. For do not ye yourselves who now regard and worship them, much more despise them?" The Christians "obey the laws, and they surpass the laws in their own lives. They love all men, and they are persecuted by all. They are ignored, and yet they are condemned. They are put to death, and yet they are endued with life. . . . They are evil spoken of, and yet they are vindicated. They are reviled, and they bless; they are insulted, and [yet] they respect. Doing good, they are punished as evil-doers. . . . War is waged against them as aliens by the Jews, and persecution is carried on against them by the Greeks; and yet those that hate them can not tell the reason of their hostility; . . . thrown to wild beasts that they may deny the Lord, and yet are not overcome."⁶⁷

⁶⁵ *Hist. Christ. Ch.* ii, 66, 67.

⁶⁶ *Dialogue*, cc. 16, 17.

⁶⁷ Bp. Lightfoot's *Apos. Fathers*, §§ 2, 5, 7.

γ) Apollonius: Jesus "was slain, as were also before him philosophers and just men. *For the just are seen to be a cause of offense to the unjust.*"⁶⁸

δ) Tertullian: "O blasphemy, bordering on martyrdom, which now attests me to be a Christian, while for that very account detests me. The cursing of a well-maintained discipline is a blessing of the name."⁶⁹ "We lay this before you as the first ground on which we urge that your hatred of the name 'Christian' is unjust." "You think the Christian a man of crime, an enemy of the gods, of the emperor, of the laws, of good morals, of all nature; yet you compel him to deny, that you may acquit him, which without his denial you could not do. You play fast-and-loose with the laws. . . . In our case, *you are either ashamed or unwilling to mention the name of our crimes.* If to be called 'a Christian' does not imply any crime, the name is surely very hateful when that of itself *is made a crime.*"⁷⁰ "But now without any sifting or knowledge . . . the mere name is made a matter of accusation; the mere name is assailed, and a sound alone brings condemnation both on a sect and its Author, while of both you are ignorant, [but] because they have such and such a designation, not because they are convicted of any wrong."⁷¹ "When you sternly lay it down in your sentences, '*It is not lawful for you [Christians] to exist,*' and with unhesitating rigor you enjoin this to be carried out, you exhibit the violence and unjust domination of mere tyranny, if you deny a thing to be lawful simply on the ground *that you wish it to be unlawful,* not because it *ought to be.*"⁷² "For but lately, in condemning a Christian to the *leno* rather than the *leo*, you made confession that a taint on our purity is considered among us something more terrible than any punishment, and any death."⁷³

Two eminent Roman historians, each independently of the other, have completely exonerated the Christians at Rome of the charge of incendiarism in the great conflagration in the year 64, which was made by Nero the occasion of the first great persecution on the part of the Romans. Edward Gibbon, Sulpicius Severus, and Tertullian unqualifiedly confirm their statements of the main facts, and add many details. All are agreed in opinion, and also reflect the popular belief of the contemporaries of the event, that the firing of Rome was the crime of one man, and that was the crime of Nero the Emperor himself. This

§ 265. Review
of
Evidence.

⁶⁸ *Monuments of Early Christianity*, c. 46.

⁶⁹ *Idolatry*, c. 14.

⁷⁰ *Apology* before the Rom. Senate, cc. 1, 2.

⁷¹ *Ib.* c. 3, close.

⁷² *Ib.* c. 4.

⁷³ *Ib.* c. 50. "*Leno . . . leo*"=subjected to the seducer to be debauched, or to the lion to be devoured.

itself justifies the statement of Tacitus, that in consequence of the terrible inflictions imposed upon the innocent Christians, there arose among the spectators of their sufferings "a feeling of compassion toward *the sufferers because they seemed not to be cut off for the public good, but as the victims of the ferocity of one man.*" In the nature of the case but few persons could conspire together in the work of incendiarism, so that in no event could that accusation be brought against the whole body of Christians. Besides, the monumental evidence in the province of Portugal proves how the persecution, inaugurated by the emperor, spread to the different and remote parts of the empire, seeking to exterminate the people who were Christians. An official correspondence, here noted, conducted between Pliny and the Emperor Trajan, relates *exclusively* to the persecution of the Christians, and describes how it shall be conducted. *The Christian religion* itself is called and treated as "*a crime.*" Loyalty to Christ was esteemed to be disloyalty to the government. The fortitude and faithfulness of Christians under trial were regarded as a contumacious "unyielding obstinacy" towards the proconsul himself, which he would not brook, but condemned as worthy of death. He doubts "whether repentance entitled to pardon," and "whether to renounce his error shall avail nothing for him who had once been a Christian; whether the [mere] name itself without any crime [attaching] should subject to punishment." For as Professor W. M. Ramsay aptly remarks, "Pliny and Trajan treat them [Christians] as outlaws and brigands, and punish them without reference to crimes." "Pliny and Trajan both assume that Christianity is itself a crime deserving of death."⁷⁴ Serenius Granianus, another proconsul of Asia, protests vigorously against the recent departure from Roman law and justice in that, in his province, Christians had been put to death without the preferring of charges, without law, without trial, without proof, and without defense, on the mere clamors of

⁷⁴ *The Church in the Roman Empire*, pp. 245, 248.

the fierce and fanatical populace. Diocletian, who reigned conjointly with Maximian (A. D. 292–305), inaugurated a persecution of ten years or more, during which churches were burned down, the sacred books were burned up, innocent men proscribed, and many martyrs made at the stake. Edward Gibbon admits that—

“The ancient apologists of Christianity have censured with equal truth and severity the irregular conduct of their persecutors, who, contrary to every principle of judicial proceeding, admitted the use of torture in order to obtain, not a confession, but a denial of the crime, which was the object of their inquiry.”

Notwithstanding, he becomes apologist for the persecutors in the same paragraph. He insists that those who confessed that they were Christians, or were so attested by others, “still retained in their own power the alternative of life and death;” that the magistrate “was persuaded that he offered them an easy pardon, since if they consented to cast a few grains of incense upon the altar, they were dismissed from the tribunal in safety and with applause!”⁷⁵ But according to the evidence adduced, the only crime confessed or attested by others was that they were Christians; that they refused to sacrifice to the heathen gods, or burn incense to the statue of Cæsar, and would not curse the name of Christ their Redeemer.⁷⁶ The very suggestion of such a surrender to the superstitious heathen is unworthy of the character of the great historian.

There were several distinctive periods or epochs in the history of these Christian persecutions which should be remarked. *First*, that in which the Romans were *indifferent* to the Christian religion, and had not yet learned to discriminate it from the religion of the Jews. From their subordination to the Romans, the Jews had granted to them and guaranteed the rights and customs of their religion. This lack of distinguishing between the religion of the two explains the remark of Suetonius, “Claudius banished from Rome all

⁷⁵ *Decline and Fall*, etc., 1, 612.

⁷⁶ See Pliny's *Epistle to Trajan*, in *Excursus B*.

the Jews, who were continually making disturbances at the instigation of one Christ"—an obvious reference to the disputes which naturally arose between these two classes of the one race concerning Jesus. If it was a period of indifference on the part of the Romans, it was certainly a period of intense activity, hatred, and persecution of the Christians on the part of the Jews, especially in the community about Jerusalem.

The *second* period was that in which the Christians were accused of most abominable crimes,—incendiarism, child-murder, cannibalism, and the like. The first instance which furnished an occasion for persecution was the great conflagration in the year 64, which destroyed most of the city of Rome. The Emperor Nero charged the Christians with the crime of incendiarism. Tacitus unqualifiedly affirms that "Nero falsely charged the guilt, and punished with the most exquisite torture, the persons . . . commonly called Christians." Suetonius openly declares that the guilt of incendiarism was the crime of no other than of Nero himself, whose emissaries were caught in the very act, and claimed to be acting under imperial orders. When his life was threatened by the infuriated mob, he blamed the Christians with the crime, and proceeded to punish them with the "exquisite torture" and burning alive, described by Tacitus.

The *third* epoch is that in which Trajan and Pliny ruled as indicated. There were investigations conducted by Pliny; but, so far as appears, the only offense of the Christians was that of hatred and hostility to mankind. The only question asked to be answered was, "*Are you a Christian?*" It was the one question which Pliny asked twice and thrice in his investigations respecting those brought to his tribunal. No questions were asked about any specific acts of crime, after the torture of the two women called "deaconesses." The mere acknowledgment that they were "Christians" was the one sufficient thing to determine their condemnation unto death.

Without evidence or trial, they were classed with robbers and brigands, and treated as outlaws.

The *fourth* epoch may be designated as "the Diocletian persecution." Maximian ruled with him conjointly A. D. 294–305, when both resigned; but the persecution which they inaugurated by their edicts in 303 continued for at least ten years, and was exceedingly distressing. Innocent men were proscribed, their property confiscated, their persons martyred, their churches were destroyed, and the Christians were required to bring forth their Scriptures and burn them publicly, under pain of being themselves burned. Sulpicius Severus says, "Never was the world more wasted by any war." The destruction of the Scriptures, of which, at this early date, there were probably but comparatively few copies in existence, will account for the fact that we have transmitted to us no known Greek manuscripts of the New Testament dating earlier than A. D. 325. The end of this persecution brings us to near the time of Constantine the Great, the first Christian emperor.

It may be worth while to consider more particularly what occasion the Christians furnished for these high-handed persecutions which looked for their extermination. The principal reasons were manifold, and to the proud and powerful Romans aggravating. The Christians did not hesitate to refuse absolutely to render idolatrous homage to the statue of the emperor; refused to recognize or worship the heathen gods chosen by the State; and on purely conscientious grounds, as a sovereign and inherent right, refused to execrate the Name of Christ. Moreover, they not only ignored the religion of the empire, but sought to introduce a "new" and an *illegal religion* in the worship of Jesus Christ as Creator and Lord of all. The Romans did not recognize the inalienable rights of conscience in any man, and, as they saw it, loyalty to Christ meant disloyalty to the government, which was treason and punishable with death.

§ 266. Occasion
for
Persecution.

The Roman Government and people were the more devoted to their own religion because it was their ancestral religion, and accordingly opposed resolutely whatever proposed to displace and destroy their own ancient faith. This was the more exasperating to them, inasmuch as Christianity was, in their view, the seditious offshoot from Judaism, and from a place regarded as the very hearthstone of a detested superstition; itself "a new and mischievous superstition" which had no history before it, and no nation behind it, to make it respectable, and which, withal, sought to elevate and impose upon others, as an object of worship, one who had been crucified between two thieves as an outlaw—a "dead Jew."

Dr. Philip Schaff represents the situation thus:

"The piety of Romulus and Numa was believed to have laid the foundation of the power of Rome. To the favor of the deities of the Republic, the brilliant success of the Roman arms was attributed. . . . The emperor [himself] was *ex officio* the *pontifex maximus* [high priest of the empire], and even an object of worship. The gods were national, and the eagle of Jupiter Capitolinus moved as a good genius before the world-conquering legions. Cicero lays down as a principle of legislation, that *no one should be allowed to worship foreign gods, unless they were recognized by public statute. Mæcenas counseled Augustus: 'Honor the gods according to the custom of our ancestors, and compel others to worship them. Hate and punish those who bring in strange gods.'*"

"In North Africa arose the proverb: 'If God does not send rain, lay it on the Christians.'" "At every inundation, or drought, or famine, or pestilence, the fanatical populace cried, 'Away with the Atheists!' 'To the lions with the Christians!' Persecutions were sometimes started by priests, jugglers, merchants, and others who derived their support from their idolatrous worship. These, like Demetrius of Ephesus, and the masters of the sorceress at Philippi, kindled the fanaticism and indignation of the mob against 'the new religion,' for its interference with their gains."⁷⁷

a) Celsus wrote: "O sincere believers, you find fault with us because we do not recognize this individual [Jesus] as God, nor agree that he endured these [sufferings] for the benefit of mankind."⁷⁸
 "If you should tell them that Jesus is not the Son of God, but that God is the Father of all, and that he alone should be truly worshiped, they would not consent to discontinue their worship of him as their leader in the sedition. And

ness of
Persecutors.

⁷⁷ *Hist. Christ. Church*, ii, 41-44; comp. Acts xix, 24; xvi, 16.

⁷⁸ *Cels.* ii, 88.

they call him the Son of God, not out of any extreme reverence for God, but from an extreme desire to extol Jesus Christ.”⁷⁹ “You . . . set up as a God one who ended a most infamous life by a most miserable death.”⁸⁰

β) Porphyry: “That man is not so much of an Atheist who neglects the worship of the images of the gods as he who transfers to God the opinions of the multitude.”⁸¹ “For since Jesus has been honored, none have received any public benefit from the gods.”⁸² “Jesus Christ is a man illustrious for piety, and he is more powerful than Æsculapius and all the other gods.”⁸³ “Christ, therefore, is not to be calumniated; they should be pitied who worship him as God.”⁸⁴

γ) Hierocles: “That all may perceive our just and reasonable judgment, and the levity of the Christians, forasmuch as we do not esteem him [Apollonius] who did these things a god, but a man favored by the gods, . . . whereas they [the Christians], for the sake of a few tricks, call Jesus God!”⁸⁵

δ) Julian: When the Alexandrian Christians presented to the emperor a petition requesting that he would revoke his edict banishing their Bishop Athanasius from Egypt, the emperor replied:

“By the gods, ye men of Alexandria, I am ashamed that any Alexandrian should acknowledge himself a Galilean. . . . Alexander, the Ptolemies and other princes, their founders and patrons, were worshippers of the gods; and had not raised their city and constitution to its grandeur by the words of Jesus, nor by the doctrine of the hateful Galileans. None of these gods do ye worship; but Jesus, whom neither you nor your fathers have seen, him you think to be God, the Word.”⁸⁶ “We ought to pity rather than hate men who suffer the greatest calamity, . . . which calamity they bring upon themselves for forsaking the immortal gods, betaking themselves to dead men.”⁸⁷ “But you love Christ, and esteem him the tutelar patron of your city, instead of Jupiter and Apollo of Daphne.”⁸⁸ “It concerns me extremely that all the gods are despised.”⁸⁹ “Forbear to converse with the wives, children, and servants of the Galileans, who are impious towards the gods, and prefer impiety to religion.”⁹⁰

A crude drawing, caricaturing Christ, discovered in 1857, but dating in the second or third century, serves to

⁷⁹ *Cels.* viii, 14.

⁸⁰ *Ib.* vii, 53.

⁸¹ Porphyry's Letter to his wife, cited by Neander in *Ch. Hist.* i, 171.

⁸² See *Lard.* vii, 438.

⁸³ *Ib.* vii, 445.

⁸⁴ Neand. *Ch. Hist.* i, 171.

⁸⁵ *Lard.* vii, 478, 479.

⁸⁶ *Ib.* vii, 643.

⁸⁷ *Edict to People of Bostra, Ib.* vii, 651.

⁸⁸ *Mispogon, Ib.* 647.

⁸⁹ *Epis. to Ecditius, Ib.* vii, 644.

⁹⁰ *Letter to Arsacius, high priest of Galatia, Ib.* vii, 645.

illustrate the spirit of contempt for Jesus Christ in his death, and ridicule of the religious sentiments of the Christians which prevailed at that time about the imperial palace. It was found in Rome, in the basement of the *Palace of the Cæsars*, on the wall which is now in ruins on the western slope of the Palatine Hill, and is preserved in the *Kircheriano Museo*, near the Vestal Virgins. The figure is that of a man clad in a toga, extended on a cross, having the head of a horse or ass, and a human figure before it in the attitude of homage. Underneath is a Greek inscription rudely scratched, reading

“ALEXAMENOS WORSHIPS [HIS] GOD.”⁹¹

It is certain that in the second century both Jews and Christians were ridiculed as being worshipers of the ass; and it is a known fact that at this time there were Christians within the imperial palace. Tertullian refers to another caricature on the same subject. In his *Apology* to the Roman Senate he says:

“Lately a new edition of our god has been given to the world in that great city [Rome]. It originated with a certain vile man [a Jew named Onocoites],* who was wont to hire himself out to cheat the wild beasts, and who exhibited a picture with this inscription:

‘THE GOD OF THE CHRISTIANS, BORN OF AN ASS.’

He had the ears of an ass, was hooped in one foot, carried a book, and wore a toga. Both the name and the figure gave us amusement. But our opponents ought straightway to have done homage to this bi-formed divinity; for they have acknowledged gods dog-headed and lion-headed, with horn of buck and ram, with goatlike loins, with serpent legs, with wings sprouting from the back or foot! These things we have discussed out of the abundance, that we might not seem willingly to pass by any rumor against us unrefuted.”⁹²

Since the whole government was so decidedly opposed to Christianity, it is easy to understand that Christians were exposed to every method of persecution which caprice or malice

* Or Onocœtes.

⁹¹ Ἀλεξάμενος σέβει [αὶ] θεόν. See Schaff's *Hist. Christ. Church*, ii, 272, note; and Bennett's *Archæol. of Christian Art*, pp. 94, 95.

⁹² *Apology*, c. 16; comp. *Ad Nationes*, Lib. 1, c. 14; ii, 11.

might suggest. The pen of ridicule prepared society to make of the Christian religion a laughing-stock; the pencil of caricature made their devotions a butt and byword of scorn in the community; and any form of assault upon their persons to cause pain and suffering was considered as done under the sanction of a virtual license. This was the natural sequence of the fact that the magistrates of the law gave away the lives of the Christians to the most horrible deaths on the clamors of an ignorant and superstitious rabble.

The character and modes of Roman punishment may be briefly indicated. It is not to be supposed that these methods were expressly invented to be inflicted upon the Christians; but as they were employed prior to the Christian era, there is no reason for believing that they were not *expressly appropriated* to that purpose. The descriptions given are taken from the writings of the most prominent and reliable of the Roman minds, and all were adverse to the Christian faith.

a) Juvenal: "Do you expose Tegellinus [one of Nero's court], and you will blaze in that torch where, with throats transfixed to a stake and emitting froth, they stand and burn, and you draw a furrow in the midst of the sand."⁹³

β) Martial: "You have perhaps seen recently acted in the theater, Mucius, him who thrusts his hand into the fire. If you think such an one patient, valiant, stout, you are a senseless dotard. For it is a much greater thing, when threatened with the troublesome coat, to say 'I do not sacrifice [to thy gods]' than to obey the command, 'Burn the hand.'"⁹⁴

γ) Seneca: "Imagine here a prison, crosses, and racks, and the hook; and a stake thrust through the body and coming out at the mouth; and limbs torn by chariots pulling adverse ways; and the coat besmeared and interwoven with materials nutriment for fire; and, besides these, whatever else cruelty has invented. It is no wonder if, in such case, fear rises high where the variety of evils is so great, and the preparation is so terrible."⁹⁵

§ 270. III. The Voice of Modern Historians.

1. Edward Gibbon: "The primitive Christian demonstrated his faith by his virtues; and it was justly supposed that the divine persua-

⁹³ *Satura (Satira)*, i, 155-157. ⁹⁴ *Lib. x, Epigr. 35.*

⁹⁵ Seneca's *Letter*, xiv, cited in *Lard.* vi, 637.

sion which enlightened or subdued the understanding, must at the same time purify the heart and direct the actions of the believer. The first apologists of Christianity who justify the innocence of their brethren, and the writers of a later period who celebrate the sanctity of their ancestors, display in the most lively colors the reformation of manners which was introduced into the world by the preaching of the gospel. . . . It is a very ancient reproach, suggested by the ignorance and malice of infidelity, that the Christians allured into their party the most atrocious criminals, who, as soon as they were touched by a sense of remorse, were easily persuaded to wash away in the water of baptism the guilt of their past conduct, for which the temples of the gods refused to grant them any expiation." "Those who survey with a curious eye the revolutions of mankind, may observe that the gardens and circus of Nero on the Vatican, which were polluted with the blood of the first Christians, have been rendered still more famous by the triumph and *by the abuse of the persecuted religion*. On the same spot a temple, which far surpasses the ancient glories of the Capitol, has been since erected by the Christian pontiffs, who, deriving their claim of universal dominion from an humble fisherman of Galilee, have succeeded to the throne of the Cæsars, given laws to the barbarian conquerors of Rome, and extended their spiritual jurisdiction from the coasts of the Baltic to the shores of the Pacific Ocean."⁹⁶

2. Dr. Thomas Arnold: Referring to the Church of San Stefano at Rome, this writer remarks:

"It is likely enough, too, that Gibbon has truly accused the general statements [given by monks] of exaggeration. But this is a thankless labor. Divide the sum total of the reported martyrs by twenty, by fifty if you will; after all, you have a number of persons of all ages and sexes suffering cruel torments and death for conscience' sake and for Christ's; and by their sufferings, manifestly with God's blessing, insuring the triumph of Christ's Gospel. Neither do I think that we consider the excellence of this martyr spirit half enough. . . . As God's grace enabled rich and delicate persons, women and even children, to endure all extremes of pain and reproach in times past, so there is the same grace no less mighty now; and if we do not close ourselves against it, it might be in us no less glorious in the time of trial."⁹⁷

3. William E. H. Lecky, himself a rationalist, criticises severely Gibbon's cold-blooded account of the early persecutions of the Christians. He says:

"The complete absence of all sympathy with the heroic courage manifested by the martyrs, and the frigid and in truth most unphilo-

⁹⁶ *Decline and Fall, etc.*, 1, xvi, pp. 543, 602, Amer. ed.

⁹⁷ Cited by Schaff, *Hist. of Christ. Ch.* ii, 81.

sophical severity with which the historian [Gibbon] has weighed the words and actions of men engaged in the agonies of a deadly struggle, must repel every generous nature; while the persistence with which he estimates persecutions by the number of deaths, rather than the amount of suffering, diverts the mind from the really distinctive atrocities of the pagan persecutions." "There was a time when it was the just boast of the Romans, that no refinement of cruelty, no prolongation of torture, were admitted in their stern but simple penal code. But all this was changed. Those hateful games which made the spectacle of human suffering and death the delight of all classes, had spread their brutalizing influence wherever the Roman name was known; had rendered millions absolutely indifferent to the sight of human suffering; had produced in many, in the very center of an advanced civilization, a relish and a passion for torture, a rapture and an exultation in watching the spasms of extreme agony, such as an African or an American savage alone can equal." . . . "For the love of their Divine Master, for the cause they believed to be true, men and even weak girls, endured those things without flinching, when one word would have freed them from their sufferings. No opinions we may form of the proceedings of priests in a later age, should impair the reverence with which we bend before the martyr's tomb."⁹⁸

4. Dr. Philip Schaff: "It was not so much the amount of suffering which challenges our attention—although it was terrible enough—as the spirit with which the early Christians bore it. Men and women of all classes, noble senators and learned bishops, . . . hoary-headed pastors and innocent children, approached their tortures in no temper of unfeeling indifference and obstinate defiance, but, like their Divine Master, with calm self-possession, humble resignation, gentle meekness, triumphant hope, and forgiving charity.

"Only two imperial persecutions—those of Decius and Diocletian—extended over the empire. But Christianity was always an illegal religion from Trajan to Constantine, and subject to annoyance and violence everywhere." "The long and bloody war of heathen Rome against the Church . . . utterly failed. It began in Rome under Nero, and it ended near Rome at the Milvian bridge under Constantine."⁹⁹

5. McClintock and Strong: "The very earliest sufferings of the Church of Christ and its Head are the subjects of New Testament history. . . . The last persecution of the Christians began in the nineteenth year of the Emperor Diocletian, A. D. 303. The most violent promoters of it were Hierocles the philosopher, who wrote against the Christian religion, and Galerius, whom Diocletian had declared Cæsar. . . . The human imagination was indeed almost exhausted in inventing a variety of tortures."¹⁰⁰

⁹⁸ *Hist. European Morals*, i, 494, *et seq.*

⁹⁹ *Hist. Christ. Church*, ii, 75, 76, 34.

¹⁰⁰ *Cyclop.* vii, 965, 966.

A GENERAL SURVEY OF THE SITUATION.

A circumstance injurious to the success of Christianity was the *self-exposure* to persecutions imposed upon all who embraced and adhered to that religion. In view of the natural heart, this was necessitated by the aggressive character of the Gospel itself, for by nature it was more than exclusive of all other religions; it was uncompromising in its demands respecting them. In its inherent spirituality and purpose, it was thoroughly antagonistic toward all heathen and traditional beliefs of men. It recognized no friends among the nations; it permitted no protection from any earthly power; it allowed no treaty of peace with the disbeliever. Though it employed the gentlest methods of persuasion, it exacted an unqualified submission to its own behests. It could do no less, since it involved a movement of men's conscience in the direction of truth as an appeal for the salvation of mankind.

§ 271. Character of the Gospel.

The Gospel was to be enforced by its own exactions. The Christian apostle met the philosopher pursuing his studies at the porch of the Academy, saying: "The world by wisdom knew not God." "Hath not God made foolish the wisdom of this world? God hath chosen the foolish things of this world to confound the wise; . . . for it hath pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe." He met the heathen priests beneath the shadow of their own temple, attired in their most gorgeous apparel, engaged in their sacerdotal rites at the altars, and told them: "Your pretense of religion is a degrading superstition and a cheat!" He entered the synagogue of the Jew, and said: "Your ceremonies have outlived their usefulness; your system has become a mere worthless shell; and your last chance of eternal life is to devote your whole heart and life in service to the Man of Nazareth, whom you have despised and crucified!" He told

the average unbeliever: "You are a depraved sinner: you must repent of your sins and reform your life, or you will be damned."

Whatever beliefs, wherever found, whatever institutions of ancient origin, whatever laws, however wise, whatever customs however venerated, which had come down from antiquity with the sanction and sanctity of an ancestral religion, were required to submit without qualification to the supremacy of the new religion of Jesus Christ. There was no place left for the pomp and display coveted by the natural man. Temples built of rarest marbles, flashing in all the lights of the skies; priests robed in brilliant costumes, ministering in ceremonies on festive occasions; public games religiously observed in honor of Jupiter, the supreme god, who was supposed to preside; the imposing processions organized for the entertainment of the populace,—these were the very things to be relinquished and replaced by a religion of humility without display; a religion which was without a temple, without an altar, without a priest, without a sacrifice, and without the statue of a god.

Such exactions and such antagonisms, of course, enraged the people. Senators, magistrates, magnates, and rulers; men of distinction, of position, and power in society and in the State, naturally scorned the upstart religion of the Nazarene, which would undertake in one stroke to remove both the histories and the mysteries of their own ancient and ancestral worship, substituting a life of self-denial and self-humiliation. Kings who had ruled their realms in peace; emperors who were high priests of the religion of the empire; conquerors who had received triumphs at the Roman Capital, became alarmed and were aroused to determined resistance and hostility to the new and pernicious superstition. For all understood perfectly that Christianity proposed to displace the gods adopted by the empire, and in place enthrone One whom they designated

§272. The Effects on the Natural Man.

“a dead Jew.” Could any proposition have carried with it more to disgust and excite the antagonism of the lordly and powerful Roman? But they were filled with astonishment and dismay when they learned that the people were flocking by multitudes from the old altars to embrace the new religion; that their ancestral faith, which had been incorporated into the very structure of society and the government, and had applied to all the civic functions of the State, and ruled in all the military expeditions of the empire, must hereafter be disavowed and destroyed, for the establishment of another kingdom which shall know no end. Naturally enough, as a matter of reprisal and for the suppression of the new faith, laws were legislated making Christianity unlawful, and imperial edicts were issued for the extinction of the Christian religion by the extermination of its subjects, declaring its acceptance henceforth an act of high treason!

From such ground it is easy to see what would naturally follow. Persecutions fierce and cruel arose, the like of which the world has never seen. How could Christianity be maintained, much less voluntary accessions be made to its numbers, with the opposition of the powerful government of earth and hell? Everything was now at stake. It darkens the soul to contemplate the atrocities perpetrated upon a people whose whole offense was the crime of being good. *On the human side, the most astounding wonder is that the world should ever have believed on Christ*; for his followers knew that they must be willing to lay down their lives for his sake and the gospel's; for the Savior had said that he that loved father or mother, son or daughter, more than Christ, was not worthy of him. Nevertheless, to be driven from one's home, to go unloved by the nearest kindred; to draw down upon one's self the open hostility of those dearest to us on earth, with the passionate revenges of rulers who were clothed with an irresponsible power, is a fearful test of human fidelity. But the Christians chose to escape to the wilds and wastes of the des-

ert; to be exiled from the dearest friends of affection, and betake themselves to the solitudes of the wilderness; to hold fellowship with the wild beasts in the dens and caves of the mountains; to take refuge in the catacombs underneath the city of Rome, and receive communion in remembrance of Christ in its rocky chapel; or die and be buried by fellow-refugees in the niches of those dark and silent galleries of stone underground, satisfied in death to have the simplest symbol or expression of their faith carved over the place of sepulture, rather than make the surrender implied in worshipping fictitious gods, or revile the Savior's name. Their happiness of spirit brought charms to the solitudes of their dwelling-place. Immured in dungeons, they join in midnight praise-meetings, and Divine power bowed the prison walls, shook the earth, and freed the prisoners from their stocks.

What is the meaning of this sublime endurance for the sake of Jesus? It certainly was not because the primitive Christians possessed a sullen perverseness of spirit, that in the exactions of the Roman Government they so nobly braved such nameless wrongs without repining, choosing to suffer all kinds of insults and injuries rather than recant their faith and blaspheme the Christ of their love, or burn incense before the statue of Cæsar and his false gods. Their only return is made in the sweetness of a forgiving spirit:

§ 273. Exalta-
tion in
Sufferings.

“Dearly beloved, avenge not yourselves, but rather give place unto wrath. . . . Be not overcome of evil, but overcome evil with good.”
“But let none of you suffer as a murderer, or as a thief, or as an evil-doer, or as a busybody in other men's matters; yet if any man suffer as a Christian, let him not be ashamed, but let him glorify God on this behalf.”

“Whence but from heaven could men unskilled in arts,
In several ages born, in several parts,
Weave such agreeing truths? or how, or why,
Should all conspire to cheat us with a lie?
Unasked their pains, ungrateful their advice,
Starving their gain, and martyrdom their price.”—DRYDEN.

INDUCTIONS.

The facts established by the foregoing evidence warrant the following inductions:

1. That the real position, spirit, and character of the primitive Christians were misunderstood both by the Jews and Romans.
2. That the Christians merely maintained their inalienable rights of conscience and just judgment touching their own worship.
3. That the imposition of tortures and death on Christ's followers was a departure from the ancient Roman laws and justice.
4. That the severity of the Christians' sufferings was such as even excited the sympathy of the heathen spectators and public.
5. That the offense the most offensive to the Romans was the rejection of their deities, and the exaltation of Jesus Christ as God.
6. That the kingdom of Jesus Christ on earth, being spiritual and imperishable, can not be destroyed by any power possessed by man.
7. That the doctrine and faith of the primitive Christians respecting Jesus Christ were identical with those of Christendom to-day.

CHAPTER XIV.

UNIQUE CONDITION OF PALESTINE FOR THE
FIRST FIFTY YEARS.

- I. THE UNIQUE CONDITION OF SOCIETY AND THE COUNTRY.
- II. TWO CIVILIZATIONS SIDE BY SIDE IN ONE COMMUNITY.
- III. SUDDEN CHANGES OF RULERS UNDER IMPERIAL GOVERNMENT.
- IV. EVIDENTIAL VALUE OF MINOR CIRCUMSTANCES IN HISTORY.

CHAPTER XIV.

UNIQUE CONDITION OF PALESTINE FOR FIFTY YEARS.

§274. Sources: Biographical Epitomes of Witnesses and Literature.

1. FLAVIUS JOSEPHUS (born A. D. 37, died about 103), whose birth occurred in the eighth year after the ascension of Christ, according to the Christian Calendar, was born in the first year of the reign of Caligula, the Roman Emperor. He was accordingly the contemporary of the Apostle John, and died about the same time.

Josephus was a priest of the Jews, a Pharisee in sect, the governor of Galilee, a general in the Roman-Jewish war, and an historian in literature. He became commander of the Jewish forces at the famous fortress named Jutapata, to resist the Roman invasion begun by Vespasian. After a siege of seven weeks, and suffering great distress, he was compelled to surrender; an offense to the Jews which they have never forgiven him. A prisoner of war, he was kindly treated, and had unusual privileges accorded him at the Roman headquarters. From thence he became a personal witness of all the military details and events which occurred later, in the investment of Jerusalem under Titus. He has furnished the very best historical account extant of the reduction of the Holy City to a ruin, the burning of the Jewish temple, the complete destruction of the Jewish nation, the expatriation of "the peculiar people," and the subjection of his surviving countrymen to untold humiliation and distresses, exactly accordant with the sorrowful prediction of Jesus Christ concerning that generation. These events occurred in A. D. 70, and Josephus wrote his history of this war about the year 75. According to the opinion of Dr. Schaff, this work was completed prior to his writing the *Antiquities of the Jews*, which was not long before his death. As indicating the character of the *Wars*, Josephus claims to have had the indorsement of Vespasian and Titus, the two who conducted the invasion, and afterwards became emperors. He also states that Titus affixed his signature to verify the accuracy of his history of the war, and that he ordered it to be published; and that King Herod Agrippa II, who also had a command against the Jews, added his personal approval in verification, as may be seen

in two letters which appear in the Life of Josephus prefixed to his works, § 65. For a discussion *pro* and *con* respecting the genuineness of the celebrated testimony concerning Jesus Christ, see Appendix A, and *Wars* I, c. 1, § 9.

2. Suetonius (wrote about 110 A. D.) was the celebrated biographer of the "Twelve Cæsars" who ruled the Roman Empire. He was the secretary of Hadrian through the friendly offices of Pliny, junior. That circumstance gives an added value to these biographies, for the reason that he sustained such confidential relations with the emperor as secured for him access to the governmental archives. In two of his biographies he refers to Christ, though briefly, and to the Christians thrice.
3. CELSUS (wrote A. D. 150-175) was a Greek Eclectic philosopher, although mentioned by Origen as an Epicurean. Nothing is known of his personal life or his ancestors. He was, however, the literary champion and the first writer who endeavored to extinguish Christianity with his pen, employing all the force of learning, wit, and ridicule against the Christian faith. His work was entitled *Δόγος Ἀληθής, A True Discourse*. He first represents himself fictitiously as a Jew believing in the *supernatural*—a belief, however, which he actually rejected; and then he endeavored to test the Christian religion by the principles of his philosophy. Withal, he is said to have mingled much with the Jews to learn all he could against Christianity, making capital from their unctuous hate toward the Christians. His work was published about one hundred years after the publication of the four Gospels, which he often cites. The *Encycl. Britannica*, under his name, observes: "He takes note of almost every objection which has been brought against Christianity, and his position is substantially that which is assumed by the scientific opponents of Christianity in the present day." Dr. Schaff remarks: "Lardner, Doddridge, and Leland made good use of Celsus against the Deists of their day. *He may with still greater effect be turned against Strauss and Rénan in our day.*"

We know Celsus's work only through the reply of Origen in refutation, which is entitled *Origen contra Celsum*. Origen remarks: "We are careful to guard against being supposed to pass over any of the charges advanced by him." (Bk. ii, c. 46; viii, 76.) From these comprehensive extracts made by Origen, the original work of Celsus has been reconstructed by several distinguished critics, more recently by Dr. Keim, of Zurich (1878).

Celsus had a remarkable knowledge of the contents of the New Testament, mentioning nearly every event in our Lord's life with great exactness. Unquestionably he was the possessor of a copy of those Scriptures, the authorship of which he again and again ascribes to Christ's disciples. Unfortunately his work is

marred by a malignant spirit, delighting in ridiculing what is sacred to reverent minds; that which he least understood. It was in bad taste that he employed opprobrious and scandalous language in regard to the origin of Jesus and his mother.

4. LIVY (TITUS LIVIUS) was born in North Italy B. C. 50, and resided mostly in Rome. He enjoyed an intimacy with Claudius when young, and also the favor of the Emperor Augustus. He acquired great fame by his *Annals*, written in Latin, containing a history of Rome from its foundation until the death of Drusus, B. C. 9. Of the original 142 books, only 35 are now extant. It is divided into Decades, magnifying the Roman greatness, and is written in a pleasing narrative, unlike any other ancient history in style.
5. PLUTARCH, a native Greek, studied philosophy in A. D. 66, when Nero made his notorious visit to Greece; became a Lecturer on Philosophy in Rome during the reign of Domitian (A. D. 81-96), and died in the reign of Hadrian (117-138). His literary work by which he acquired a great reputation bore the title *Parallel Lives*. It is unique in character, consisting of forty-six biographies of notable men divided into pairs. It is written in a flowing style, and is very interesting and instructive.
6. ALFORD, HENRY (1810-1871), was a distinguished scholar, theologian, and poet. A native of London, a Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, in 1834, he became Dean of Canterbury in 1856. He was a Biblical critic of the first class. He was the author of a *Greek Testament, Critically Revised Text; a Commentary* (4 vols. 1872, 6th ed.)

§ 275. Unique Condition of Palestine During the First Fifty Years of the Christian Era.

Inquire, I pray thee, of the former age, and apply thyself to that which their fathers have searched out. . . . Shall not they teach thee and tell thee?—JOB.

Let all the nations be gathered together. . . . Who among them can declare this, and show us former things? Let them bring their witnesses, that they may be justified; or let them hear and say, *It is truth*.—ISAIAH.

The points where the documents of the New Testament touch upon history proper are not direct, but indirect, and the allusions are and must be incidental. But for this very reason they are extremely important as respects their evidential value. . . . To maintain accuracy in a wide field of incidental allusion is a matter of the utmost difficulty; and no one but an honest, truthful writer would venture on such a perilous experiment at all. [It would be] utterly at variance with the mythical spirit which the narrative of the New Testament is sometimes affirmed to be the product. . . . [As such] its composers would have no object to maintain accuracy at all.—MACLEAR.

ARGUMENT.

During the first half-century of the Christian era occurred the most extraordinary changes and apparent complications in the political condition of the land unparalleled in history. This anomalous condition of society was due to sudden alterations and reversions in the local governments, occasioned by the deposing or death of the rulers severally, and the appointment of new and different functions, together with the twofold ruling of the Jews by the Romans and the Sanhedrin. The historical situation was rendered exceedingly difficult of description by any one, not a native, living in the apostolic times. Two different civilizations existing side by side in one community, having but little in common, but much in diversity in respect to religion, language, laws, and political institutions, rendered the situation complex. A study of the historical part of the New Testament demonstrates a marvelous insight on the part of the writers into the spirit and occurrences of the times, and also attests the antiquity and authenticity of the Gospels themselves.

1. The unique Condition of the Country during the First Fifty Years of the Christian Era.
2. Two Civilizations side by side in one Community and the Diversities peculiar to each.
3. Sudden Changes in Administration over the Jews, under the Imperial Government of Rome.
4. The Evidential Value of many Minor Circumstances touching the Truth of Sacred History.

I. UNIQUE CONDITION OF SOCIETY FOR FIFTY YEARS.

A scientific inquiry conducted along the line of the internal evidence of the New Testament in its historical narratives

§ 276. The
Case
Stated.

which are to have confirmation from various external sources, must take account of the political condition of Palestine as organized during that particular period. Comparisons instituted between the contents of the Book and the current facts of the times as ascertained from secular writers, with a view to the authenticity of these Scriptures, is that which is in request in such investigation. Any correspondences or discrepancies should be noted as between the sacred and secular writers, no matter how brief or incidental the mention; whether relating to persons, places, or periods; whether referring to pivotal occur-

rences in history, or to minute circumstances of seemingly inconsiderable importance. For such particulars furnish the very evidence to be sought.

A multitude of subtle indications evidence that the sacred writers were either personal witnesses of facts which they describe in their narratives, or received their information directly from those who were eye-witnesses. The principal occurrences of the times are mentioned, the names of the political rulers are given, sudden and surprising events are narrated involving governmental changes in respect to both a part and the whole of the Palestinian country, all referred to in the most incidental manner, in terms of the briefest expression, and then left unexplained, as if perfectly understood by the writers themselves and their contemporaries addressed.

The political situation of Palestine is to be investigated in reference to that period in which Jesus Christ and his apostles lived and labored for the establishment of the Christian religion. Within the limits of about §277. Condition of the Country. a half-century, beginning with the incarnation of our Lord and extending to the coronation of Herod Agrippa II, great-grandson of Herod the Great—from the first to the last of the house of the Herods—there existed a condition of public affairs probably never known for the same period in the history of the world. In the year 63 or 64 B. C., Pompey the Great made a complete conquest of the Jews, and captured Jerusalem. At the opening of the Christian era, the nation had been for a long time enduring the reign of the first Herod; for it had been specifically stipulated that their king should be from their own land, and they should live under their own laws, and maintain their own religion. But Herod the Great and his successors were the merest dependents upon the imperial will at Rome. It thence came to pass, in the distribution of authority over the Jewish nation, that its civil affairs were administered mostly by Romans, who were supreme and enforced their will by an army of occupation, while

the Jews governed themselves by a hierarchy known as the Sanhedrin, which was their supreme judicial council. Each had its own appointed place and power. The high priest had usually been chosen as president of the Council because of his eminence in wisdom and worth; but at length the high priesthood became a political appointment and was often changed by Herod Agrippa II. Previously, and at surprisingly short intervals of time, changes came touching both the government and the people, out of which arose new political divisions and combinations of territory, the assignment of new rulers of an entirely different character, by the order of the emperor at the Capital. These changes were precipitated sometimes by the deposing of a ruler, and sometimes by his death; but in either case the occasion was followed by a transfer or a reversion of the territory to the condition of a province, and sometimes by the transfer of a king from an inferior principality to a kingdom, each instance requiring a reorganization of the governmental administration.

The result was that matters of political geography among the Jews in Palestine, which seem to have been perfectly simple to the writers of that age, were intricate and difficult of understanding, if not absolutely complicated, to a writer of a century or two later. Hence Celsus, the apostle of literary opposition to the Christians, about a century after the publication of the Gospels, made egregious mistakes in tracing the history of the apostolic times; a notable instance of which occurs in his confounding Herod Antipas, the Tetrarch of Galilee and Peræa, with his father, Herod the Great, the first Herodian king of Palestine. He says:

“The Chaldeans are spoken of by Jesus as having been induced to come to him at his birth and worship him while he was yet an infant as a God; and to have made this known to Herod the tetrarch; and that the latter sent and slew all the infants that were born about the same time,”¹ etc.

¹ *Origen contra Celsum*, 1, 58.

In like manner it is claimed that the Roman historian Dion Cassius's "notices are confused. He scarcely seems able to distinguish between one Herod and another."² Yet these writers lived not far remote from the events which they attempt to describe. Such instances of mistake relating to matters of that period witness to the extreme difficulty and dangers to which later writers would be exposed who should falsely attempt to represent themselves as living in the Apostolic Age when describing the stirring and surprising events occurring around them. So with the four Evangelists writing the Gospels. They must have written in the times ascribed to them, to have written so accurately. One might have acquired the reputation of being a literary adventurer, but he would have scant hope of escaping the charge of being an impostor or a fool in presuming to foist upon mankind unhistorical documents as being Gospels of truth purporting to have been written in that remarkable country, in those remarkable times. For as remarked by Mr. George Rawlinson:

"It is important to bear in mind in this connection the fact that there is no period in the whole range of ancient history whereof we possess a more full and exact knowledge than we do of the first of our [Christian] era."³

Now, the Evangelists illustrate the times in which they lived by describing in the Gospels the current history of the period with such remarkable exactness. Sometimes they detail main facts with fullness and force; and sometimes, also, they pass important as well as incidental circumstances with briefest mention, as being perfectly understood without requiring further remark. But in all cases, they obviously speak out from amidst the current events of the Apostolic Age in which they were living, without reserve, and without explanation; and, as a consequence, so far from being contradicted by any of their contemporaries, they are often absolutely con-

² *Hist. of Rome*, xliv, liii, lv, lx, cited by Mr. George Rawlinson, *Bampton Lects.*, Amer. ed., note 21, end.

³ *Ib.* p. 383, n. 3, end.

firmed by those unfriendly to their faith, who lived in or near their own times. And, withal, the Evangelists mention public occurrences without any strain or effort, without exaggeration or glorification, but rather with that simplicity and candor of spirit which have carried conviction of truth to millions of minds in all succeeding ages.

II. TWO CIVILIZATIONS SIDE BY SIDE IN ONE COMMUNITY.

In the distribution of legal authority over the Jewish nation there were two jurisdictions. The Jewish Sanhedrin §279. Twofold Authority. was composed of the high priest, the elders and scribes;⁴ but superior in power was the office of the Roman procurator, who seems at this time to have the exclusive right over life and death. We do not know at what time the Jews lost their ancient power in this respect; but Josephus mentions "Caponius, . . . who was sent as procurator, having the power of death put in his hands by Cæsar."⁵ Accordingly, Pilate said to Jesus: "Knowest thou not that I have power to crucify thee, and have power to release thee?"⁶ "The Jews therefore said unto him: It is not lawful for us to put any man to death."⁷ The Sanhedrin could condemn Jesus as "guilty [deserving] of death," but were powerless to execute their own verdict. To secure an execution, they were compelled to deliver Jesus to Pilate, the Roman procurator.⁸ This they did. However, the indictment must not refer merely to matters of their religion; it must, in order to be entertained at all, contain an averment of a political character. So the wily conspirators against Christ inserted a charge of *treason* against him: "We found this fellow perverting the nation, and forbidding to give tribute to Cæsar, saying that he himself is king."⁹

When a foreign nation dominates another and occupies its territory, it naturally imports its own manners and procedures,

⁴ Mark xiv, 53.

⁵ *Jewish War*, B. ii, chapt. 8, §1.

⁶ John xix.

⁷ *Ib.* xviii, 31.

⁸ John xviii, 35.

⁹ Luke xxiii, 1, 2; cf. Matt. xxii, 15-21.

and the mixed population then exhibits customs incongruous, if not conflicting. So, during the ministry of Christ, and afterward, Palestine had its peculiar characteristics. Ever after Pompey's conquest the Jewish nation and country were held as a dependency upon the Roman Empire; and an army of the Romans was in occupation, ready always to enforce the requirements of the rulers, and subdue the tumultuous spirit of the Jews. By express stipulation, however, the Jews were from the first free to enjoy all the rights of their religion and the exercise of their own laws, except the power to impose and execute death. Touching the situation Ananias, the high-priest, makes this guarded concession: "If indeed it be necessary to adjust names to deeds, any one might easily find that the Romans have indeed been those who were the confirmers of our laws unto us, and that the enemies have been those within [the nation]." ¹⁰ In the final rebellion of the Jews, while Titus was conducting the siege of Jerusalem, which eventuated in the utter destruction of the city and nation, he appealed to the Jews to discontinue their resistance as fanatical. He said, according to Josephus:

§ 280. Laws
and
Customs.

"In the first place, we gave you this land to possess it; and, in the next place, have set over you kings of your own nation [viz., the Herods]; and, in the third place, have preserved the laws of your forefathers unto you, and withal permitted you to live either by yourselves or among others as you please." ¹¹

The historical argument as to the fact that the Jews and Romans at this period were existing side by side in very peculiar relations, as is constantly brought to view in the Gospels, may be further illustrated by many instances incidentally mentioned therein. Two bodies of armed men exercised authority at Jerusalem; the one was known as the Levitical temple guard called "a band," ¹² led by "a captain," ¹³ but armed

¹⁰ Wars, iv, 3, 10.

¹² Σπεῖρα, a cohort; "a band, John, xviii, 12.

¹¹ Wars, vi, 6, 2.

¹³ Στρατηγός Luke xxii, 4, 52.

“with staves and weapons;”¹⁴ the same party who arrested Jesus and bound him at the garden of Gethsemane; the other, the Roman soldiers who were an army of occupation, whose headquarters were at Cæsarea, one cohort consisting of four hundred and twenty to six hundred soldiers being stationed at the fort built at Jerusalem named Antonia, located at the northwest of the temple grounds. Here they were charged with the duty of guarding the public peace, especially on the great feast-days of the Jews. It was the duty of a small detachment to conduct to its completion the sentence of crucifixion, and to guard against the interference of friends to take the body away without express permission from the procurator.¹⁵ There were two modes of inflicting capital punishment. The old law of Jewish independence, consisting either of stoning, according to the original law of Moses, which was illegally exercised in the case of Stephen, or of strangling, according to the rabbinical law inserted in the Talmud, in which “strangulation was the mode of execution for a learned man who rebelled against their words;”¹⁶ while the Romans, after due process, were addicted to first scourge the condemned criminal, and then crucify him.¹⁷ In case of crucifixion, the Jews sought to mitigate or shorten the sufferings by what was called *crucifragium*, known in the Gospels as the breaking of the legs of the sufferer.

Both Livy (*Titus Livius*) and Josephus, who wrote their histories in the Apostolic Period, thus bear witness to the Roman custom of punishment.

a) *Scourgings*. Livy affirms that, “after they had been scourged they fastened them to crosses.”¹⁸ Josephus says:

“They caught many of the quiet people and brought them before Florus [the Roman procurator], whom he first chastised with stripes,

¹⁴ Matt. xxvi, 47; Mark xiv, 48; Luke xxii, 52; John xviii, 3, 12, Rev. Vers.

¹⁵ Matt. xxvii, 54; John xix, 23, 24, 38; Luke xxiii, 47, 51, 52; Mark xv, 43-45.

¹⁶ Deut. xiii, 9; xvii, 7; Ex. xvii, 4; Luke xx, 6; John x, 31; viii, 7; Acts vii, 58; *Talmud*, *Sanhedrin*, vi, 1, 4; *Hilchoth*, *Mamrim*, c. 1, 2.

¹⁷ Matt. xxvii, 26; Mark xv, 15; John xix, 1.

¹⁸ Livy, x, 9; he died 17 A. D.

and then crucified. . . . Florus adventured to do what no other [procurator] had done before him, to have men of the equestrian order whipped and nailed to the cross before the tribunal." "So they first whipped [them] . . . before they died, and [they] were then crucified before the walls of the city. . . . So the soldiers, out of wrath and hatred they bore the Jews, nailed those they caught, one after one way and another after another, to the crosses . . . when the multitude was so great that room was wanting for the crosses, and crosses were wanting for the bodies."¹⁹

β) *Cross-bearings.* The Romans executed their laws with rigor in cases of capital punishment, and their custom was to compel the condemned man to bear his cross to the place of crucifixion. The Gospel records an illustration of this requirement in the case of Jesus: "And he bearing his own cross, went forth unto a place called the place of a skull, . . . where they crucified him."²⁰ Plutarch wrote: "Every kind of wickedness produces its own torment, [just as] each one of the criminals bears forth his own cross."²¹ Artemidorus of Ephesus said: "The cross is the symbol of death; and he that is about to be nailed to it, first carries it along."²²

γ) *Superscription.* A superscription placed by the Romans on the tablet at the head of the cross was intended to be declarative of the supposed crime in any given case. The Gospels mention this custom in referring to the crucifixion of Jesus. John says: "Pilate wrote a title also, and put it on the cross,"²³ and Matthew adds, "and set up over his head this accusation."²⁴ His designation of the superscription as an "accusation" is significant, not as implying that the charge was true, but that it was merely an "accusation" and impliedly false.* It was a tri-written superscription in the principal languages of the world at that time; in the Hebrew, the vernacular of the Jews; in the Greek, the commercial language between nations; and in Latin, the court language of the Ro-

* Rawlinson's *Bampton Lectures*, 1859, Amer. ed., p. 401, note.

¹⁹ *Wars*, ii, 14, 9; v. 11, 1.

²⁰ John xix, 16-19.

²¹ Ἐκαστος τῶν κακοῦργων ἐκφέρει τὸν αὐτοῦ σταυρὸν.

²² *Ονειροκριτικά* (*Interpretation of Dreams*) ii, 61. Artemidorus (Daldianus) was a philosopher of Ephesus.

²³ John xix, 19, 20.

²⁴ Matt. xxvii, 87, *aitla*, *accusation*.

man Empire. The purpose of this tri-written superscription was to inform all men what the charge against Christ was.²⁵

That this use of the *tablet and its title is historical*, will be rendered sufficiently obvious by a few instances:

Hesychius, a bishop of Egypt, thus describes the tablet: "A board, a door, a plastered tablet, on which in Athens accusations against criminals were written." Suetonius, of Rome, mentions a man who "dragged from the theater the father of a family, . . . and cast him to the dogs in the arena, with the title, '*A Parmularian guilty of talking impiously.*'" Also, "At Rome in a public feast, a slave having stolen some thin plates of silver with which the couches were inlaid, he [Caligula] delivered him immediately to an executioner, with orders to cut off his hands, and lead him around the guests, with them hanging from his breast, and a label signifying the cause of his punishment."²⁶ Dion Cassius mentions a perfidious slave who was led "through the midst of the market place with a writing declaring the cause of his death, and afterwards they crucified him."²⁷

δ) *Body-Guard*. It was another custom of the Romans, in inflicting the death penalty, to place a soldier to stand guard over the body, lest some friend of the criminal should adventure to take it away for burial. In any case express permission must have been asked and given by the chief ruler before the body could be delivered to any one for sepulture. This again is exactly accordant with the statements of the four Gospels respecting the dead body of Jesus. They narrate that Joseph of Arimathea "went to Pilate and asked for the dead body of Jesus. Then Pilate commanded it to be given up. And Joseph took the body and wrapped it in a clean cloth, and laid it in his own new tomb which he had hewn out of a rock."²⁸ In harmony with this usage is the testimony of the Emperor Diocletian (284-303) and Maximian (286-293), who said:

"We do not forbid that those who are guilty of crimes, after they

²⁵ Matt. xxvii, 37; John xix, 19, 20.

²⁶ *Life Domit.*, c. 10; *Life Caligula*, c. 32.

²⁷ *History*, liv, p. 523.

²⁸ Matt. xxvii, 57, 58; Mark xv, 43-46; Luke xxiii, 50-53; John xix, 38.

have been punished, should be consigned to burial.”²⁹ Ulpianus* says: “The bodies of those who suffered capital punishment are not to be refused to their friends;” and Augustus says, “At this day the bodies of persons in question are not buried unless permission has first been sought and granted. And sometimes it is not granted, especially in the case of those condemned for treason.” “The bodies of those who suffer punishment are to be given to any requesting them for interment.”³⁰

ε) *Burial*. With the Jews, criminals were executed without the gates of the city wall, and were buried near the place of execution. The Jews, however, were accustomed to bury the bodies of criminals before the set of sun, and under no circumstances to allow the body to be exposed to birds of prey, or to molder on the cross under the disintegrating action of the sun and air. The law of Moses required that when death had been thus inflicted, the body “should not remain all night on the tree, but should be buried on the day of the execution.”³¹ Hence Josephus, referring to the siege of Jerusalem, mentions the infamy of the Idumæans, who were continually murdering those within the city, and leaving their bodies unburied. He says:

“They proceeded to that degree of impiety as to cast away their dead bodies without burial, although the Jews used to take so much care of the burial of men, that they took down those who were condemned and crucified, and buried them before the going down of the sun.”³²

ζ) *Garments*. The distribution of the garments of the crucified was a matter of the Roman law. Dean Alford remarks: “The garments of the executed were by law the perquisites of the soldiers on duty.” As in the crucifixion of our Lord, there were employed one centurion as commander, and four soldiers of the ranks; the four divided between them the garments of Jesus.³³

* Domitius Ulpianus (A. D. 170) entered upon public life under Septimus Severus and Caracalla (193-217). Ulpianus's *Digest of Julian* consists of excerpts from his works, and the *Fragments* are known as *Tutuli ex Corpore Ulpiani*.

²⁹ Rawl. *Bampton Lectures*, p. 402.

³⁰ Cited by Rawlinson, *Id.*, p. 402, note 62.

³¹ Deut. xxi, 22, 23; comp. Acts v, 30; x, 39; xiii, 29; Gal. iii, 13; 1 Pet. ii, 24.

³² *Wars*, iv, 5, 2.

³³ Alford's *Greek Testament*, Vol I, *in loco*, 6th ed; comp. John xix, 23, p. 899.

η) *Enrollments.* Two enrollments³⁴ of the Jews in Palestine were made by Cyrenius (Quirinius) under the order of the Emperor Augustus; the *first* about the time of the birth of Jesus, B. C. 4, which was to ascertain the *population* of the country; the *second*, about ten years afterward, in A. D. 6, corrected chronology, which was to ascertain the *property* of the people. The peculiarity of both instances is, that the two registries were Roman in authority and purpose, but entirely Jewish in the manner in which the enrollments were effected; that is, each person and family, in order to be enrolled, had first to go to the native tribal territory, wherever else the residence might be. Hence Joseph and Mary, who were resident at Nazareth, repaired to the territory of Judah; and, by this simple circumstance, Jesus was born at Bethlehem³⁵ of Judæa in exact fulfillment of prophetic prediction.³⁶ Then, withal, there were two different kinds of tax imposed upon the people; the one called “a tribute” tax, which Cæsar usually exacted of a conquered country. The Pharisees referred to this when they asked Jesus: “Is it lawful to give *tribute* to Cæsar, or not?”³⁷ The other tax, called *didrachma*, was given in support of the temple service, and is referred to by Matthew: “When they that received the half-shekel came to Peter and said, Doth not your Master pay the half-shekel?”³⁸

In recording time, the Evangelists employ two distinct systems of notation. Both methods were military in character.

§ 282. *Notations of Time.* The distinctive references made in the New Testament are to three particulars; viz., the several watches of the night, an interval of days when inclusive or exclusive of the extremes in which certain events occurred, and an indefinite date fixed in a certain year in the epoch of a given ruler.

θ) *Night-watches.* The Jews originally divided the night into three watches, extending from sunset to ten o'clock;

³⁴ Luke ii, 1-3; Acts v, 37.

³⁷ Matt. xxii, 17.

³⁵ Luke ii, 4.

³⁸ Matt. xvii, 24.

³⁶ Micah v, 2.

thence to two; and thence to sunrise. Jesus said: "Blessed are those servants whom the Lord when he cometh shall find watching. . . . And if he shall come in the second watch, and if in the third, and find them so, blessed are those servants."³⁹

Upon the other hand, the Romans observed four night-watches, beginning at six o'clock in the evening, and terminating every three hours severally, corresponding with the statement of "four quaternions of soldiers,"⁴⁰ mentioned as in service of Herod Antipas's army. But in consequence of the dominance of the Romans over the Jews, the latter naturally conformed to the Roman usage, and computed the fourth watch in dividing the night. So Mark says:

"Watch therefore, for ye know not when the lord of the house cometh, whether at even, or at midnight, or at cock-crowing [*i. e.*, three o'clock], or in the morning."⁴¹

ι) *Intervals.* In case of an interval of several days between two events, the *Romans excluded* the two extreme days in which the two events happened, while *the Jews* in their count *included* them. Thus between the promise of Christ and the realization of his *transfiguration*, there is a twofold enumeration by the Evangelists, Matthew reckoning the time between exclusively, "After six days;"⁴² while Luke reckons inclusively, "About eight days after."⁴³

κ) *Reigns.* The Romans dated important events according to a given year in a given emperor's reign; but the Jews reckoned according to the high priesthood of their theocracy. Now, Luke observes both methods in one notation, including all the several rulers in Palestine thus:

"Now, in the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius Cæsar, Pontius Pilate being governor of Judæa, and Herod [Antipas] being tetrarch of Galilee, and his brother Philip tetrarch of the region of Ituræa and

³⁹ Luke xii, 37, 38.

⁴⁰ Acts xii, 4; Matt. xiv, 25.

⁴¹ Mark xiii, 35.

⁴² Matt. xvii, 1.

⁴³ Luke ix, 28.

Trachonitis, and Lysanius tetrarch of Abilene, in the high priesthood of Annas and Caiaphas, the word of the Lord came unto John, the son of Zacharias, in the wilderness,"⁴⁴ etc.

Now, it should be specially remarked that such unusual particularization as this, if false, furnishes the readiest possible means of detection; but on the contrary, if true, especially when introduced into the text incidentally without a word of explanation, it furnishes powerful evidence that these Scriptures are thoroughly historical, and were written at the time usually ascribed to them.

Very subtle but ingrain evidence of the antiquity of a given document is to be found in *the language* which it employs. There are local characteristics and forms of expression which belong to and mark the age, such as Latinisms and Hebraisms in Palestine, which prevailed in the vocabulary and literature of the period, taken up into Greek forms of language, relating to the practical affairs of life and religion, which convey by necessary implication the thought of the Roman and Hebrew people living together in one body politic. They serve to illustrate, as no other method could do, a society composed of two different civilizations, having two classes of institutions, two kinds of authority, two systems of laws, two procedures in court, two sorts of punishments; all evidencing the peculiar condition of the country *at the time of Christ and his apostles, and at no period since*, when Roman power held the occupancy and the supremacy in the land of the Jews, all of which was brought to a perpetual end within forty years after the crucifixion of Jesus Christ. It is a powerful verification both of the antiquity and authenticity of these historical writings, that they should find such remarkable confirmation by both Jewish and classic historians of fame. But that which renders the case incontrovertible is the fact that the very language

§ 283. Test
of
Language.

⁴⁴ Luke iii, 1, 2; cf. *Ant.* xviii, 4, 6; xvii, 8, 1, and 11, 4.

imbedded in the accounts of the Gospels proves their age by something more substantial than the mere color of the period.

It has been forcefully said by the scholarly Trench, that “*Words are fossil history,*” and that “*any one with skill to analyze the language might re-create for himself the history of a people speaking that language.*”⁴⁵ The principle applies to the historical New Testament without question. It is the function of language to give expression to the thought and life of those with whom it was vernacular.

Some illustrations are now to be furnished. We thus have the word—

Centurion, meaning the commander of a hundred soldiers of the Roman army.⁴⁶

Legion, usually a great but indefinite number; strictly 4,200 to 6,000 soldiers.⁴⁷

Prætorium, the official judgment-seat among Romans for the trial of causes.⁴⁸

Custody, a guard set to watch and keep prisoners in their power.⁴⁹

Census, a registering of population, or rating of property valuation for taxing.^{50 51 52}

Quadrans, a small Roman coin worth an English “farthing” or an American half-cent.⁵³

⁴⁵ *Study of Words*, p. 96, Eng. ed.

LATIN.	GREEK.	ENGLISH.	REFERENCE.
⁴⁶ <i>Centurio</i> ,	κεντυρίων,	centurion,	Mark xv, 39, 44, 45.
⁴⁷ <i>Legio</i> ,	λεγεών,	a legion,	Matt. xxvi, 53; Luke viii, 30.
⁴⁸ <i>Prætorium</i> ,	πραιτώριον,	judgment-hall, etc.,	John xviii, 28; xix, 9, etc.
⁴⁹ <i>Custodia</i> ,	κουστωδία,	custody, watch,	Matt. xxvii, 65, 66;
⁵⁰ <i>Census</i> ,	κῆνσος	tax enumeration.	Matt. xvii, 25.
⁵¹ <i>Descriptio</i> ,	ἀπογραφὴ,	enrollment or registration.	Acts v, 37.
⁵² <i>Profiteor</i> ,	ἀπογράφεσθαι	to make a public return,	Luke ii, 1-3, 5.
⁵³ <i>Quadrans</i> ,	κοδράντης,	farthing, half-cent,	Matt. v, 26; Mark xii, 42.

Assarius, another Roman coin of about the same value as that of the quadrans.⁵⁴

Denarius, translated by the English "penny," and worth about two cents in America.⁵⁵

Drachma, a silver coin of the Greeks, worth about sixteen cents in American money.⁵⁶

Flagello, to scourge, a peculiar form of lashing prisoners both Jewish and Roman.⁵⁷

Executioner, an officer of the body-guard to carry out a judicial death sentence.⁵⁸

Besides these words, which are mostly of Roman origin, there are others employed in the New Testament derived from the Hebrew or later Aramaic language, the letters of which the Jews brought with them from their captivity. Thus we have—

Corban, a sacrificial or dedicatory gift of the temple service.⁵⁹

Rabbi, which means "My Master,"⁶⁰ and *Rabboni*, "My great Master."⁶¹

Raca, a senseless, empty-headed fellow; a fool; one who is worthless.⁶²

Bar-jona, a Hebrew formula to express "son of Jona."⁶³

LATIN.	GREEK.	ENGLISH.	REFERENCE
⁵⁴ <i>Assarius</i> ,	ἀσσάριον,	farthing, a half-cent.	Matt. x, 29; Luke xii, 6.
⁵⁵ <i>Denarius</i> ,	δηνάριον,	penny,	Matt. xviii, 28; xx, 2, 9, 10, 13; Mark vi, 37.
⁵⁶ <i>Drachma</i> ,	δραχμή,	[lost] "piece of silver,"	Luke xv, 8, 9.
⁵⁷ <i>Flagello</i> ,	φραγελλώ,	to scourge,	Matt. xxvii, 26; Mark xv, 15.
⁵⁸ <i>Speculator</i> ,	σπεκουλάτωρ,	executioner.	Mark vi, 27.
HEBREW.	GREEK.	ENGLISH.	REFERENCE.
⁵⁹ קָרְבָּן,	κορβᾶν,	"Corban,"	Mark vii, 11.
⁶⁰ רַבִּי,	ῥαββι,	"Rabbi."	John iii, 2.
⁶¹ רַבּוֹנִי,	ῥαββουνι, ῥαββονι,	Rabboni,	John xx, 16; x, 51.
⁶² רָקָא	ῥακά,	a worthless fellow, a simpleton,	Matt. v, 22
⁶³ בַּר-יוֹנָה,	Βαριωνᾶ,	Bar-Jona, son of Jona,	Matt. xvi, 17.

Boanerges, sons of thunder, a designation applied by Jesus to James and John.⁶⁴

Kephas, a rock; a name given to Peter by Christ, after his great confession.⁶⁵

Gehenna, a valley running east and west, lying south of Jerusalem.⁶⁶

Talitha cumi, "Damsel, arise;" words spoken by Jesus to the daughter of Jairus.⁶⁷

Ephphatha, "Be thou opened;" Christ's address to the deaf and dumb man.⁶⁸

Hosanna, the shout of the multitude on the mount of Olives, near Jerusalem.⁶⁹

Jot (י), the smallest letter in the Hebrew alphabet; and *tittle*, the little tick on the smallest Hebrew letter.⁷⁰

By so much as the sacred biographers represent in their several Gospels the language employed by the people of the country in which they wrote during that particular period, by so much do they demonstrate both the antiquity and the historicity of their writings.

SUDDEN CHANGES IN THE POLITICAL GEOGRAPHY OF PALESTINE.

Frequent changes in the rulers and realms of the country, occurring at brief intervals, necessitated changes also in the form of the local government. First, there was an unbroken kingdom over all the land; then through the king's death came divisions of the territory, with conversion into three

HEBREW.	GREEK.	ENGLISH.	REFERENCE.
⁶⁴ בְּנֵי-רָעַשׁ	Βοανεργές,	"sons of thunder,"	Mark iii, 17.
⁶⁵ כִּפָּא	Κηφᾶς,	Cephas,	John i, 42. 405
⁶⁶ גֵּיהֵנָם	Γέεννα,	"Gehenna" [figure of Perdition],	Matt. v, 29, 30.
⁶⁷ טְלִיְתָא קוּמִי	ταλιθὰ κοῦμι,	"Maiden, arise,"	Mark v, 41.
⁶⁸ אֶפְפָּתַח	ἐφφαθά,	Ephphatha,	Mark vii, 34.
⁶⁹ הוֹשִׁיעָה נָא	ὠσαννά,		Matt. xxi, 9; Mark xi, 9; John xii, 13.
⁷⁰ יוֹד אֶחָת אוֹ קֶרֶן אֶחָת	ἰῶτα ἐν ἡ μία κεφαλή,	one jot or one tittle,	Matt. v, 18.

principalities of unequal sizes; then two of the successors were deposed and the third ruler died, when two principalities became Roman provinces, and the third was transferred to an adjacent kingdom; then followed unification of the two provincial divisions with the same kingdom which now covered the land; then, after three years, the king died, and the kingdom became provincial, and was governed by Roman procurators; when, after a few years more, a new kingdom was erected out of a portion of the original territory, and the rest remained a Roman province until the end of the Jewish nationality, when all became Roman again.

§ 284. Changes of Government.

The point of the argument to be observed here is, that the four Evangelists, without the least strain or effort, wrote their several Gospels with a strict understanding of the times, and with entire inerrancy of statement. They refer to the several rulers and governments without any explanation of the changes, in the most familiar and incidental manner, as only those could do who lived in the midst of these changes and complications, as the most celebrated writers absolutely failed to do, such as Tacitus, Dion Cassius, and Celsus* did, who wrote shortly after the Apostolic Age. This justly puts the seal of truth upon the antiquity and authenticity of the Gospels.

When the nativity of Jesus occurred, the whole land was one consolidated kingdom ruled by Herod the Great. The king probably died within a few months, and his kingdom was divided and transferred to his three sons; but the kingdom was changed, one-half becoming an *Ethnarchy*, ruled by his eldest son Archelaus, and the other half divided about equally and converted into two *Tetrarchies*, governed respectively by Antipas and his brother Philip II.⁷¹ The ethnarchy of Archelaus was constituted of the several geographical divisions of the country known as Idumæa, Judæa, and Samaria. That

* See chap. iii, p. 69, § 37, note.

⁷¹ Josephus, *Ant.* xvii, c. 11, § 4.

portion which fell to Antipas was the tetrarchy constituted of the two geographical divisions called Galilee, a region on the west of the Galilean sea, and a narrow tract stretching from the Sea of Galilee on the east of the Jordan River and the Dead Sea. The tetrarchy of Philip embraced that region of country to the east of the Galilean Sea and Lake Hulon or Merom, known as "Batanæa, Trachonitis, Auranitis, and some parts of Jamnia."⁷²

Changes came in these several administrations at brief and irregular periods. In A. D. 6, in corrected chronology, Archelaus was deposed and banished, and his ethnarchy was reduced to a Roman province, governed by Coponius, Procurator of Syria.⁷³ The two tetrarchies of Antipas and Philip continue as tetrarchies. Then, in the year 34, Philip died, and leaving no son to succeed him in the government, his territory became a Roman province united with that of Syria.⁷⁴ In the year 37, Caligula, having become emperor at Rome, made the grandson of Herod the Great, named Agrippa, king of that country which had been the tetrarchy of Philip, and seems to have promised to add the tetrarchy of Lysanias.⁷⁵ In the year 39, Antipas was deposed and banished, and his tetrarchy was incorporated into the kingdom of his nephew Agrippa.⁷⁶ In the year 41, Claudius succeeded Caligula on the imperial throne at Rome, and for special services rendered by Agrippa I in his interests, the emperor added "all that country over which Herod [the Great], who was his grandfather, had reigned; that is, Judæa and Samaria;" also adding Abila of Lysanias's tetrarchy thereto.⁷⁷ But now, in the year 44, Agrippa I died, and his territory, which included all Palestine, became a Roman province; and Claudius "sent Cuspius Fadus to be procurator of Judæa, and the whole of the kingdom."⁷⁸ Finally, in the year 53, Claudius

⁷² *Wars*, B. ii, c. 6, § 3.

⁷⁴ *Ant.* xviii, 4, 6.

⁷⁶ *Ant.* xviii, 4, 6, end; c. 7, § 2; *Wars*, ii, 9, 6.

⁷⁸ *Ib.* xix, 9, 1, 2; *Wars*, ii, 11, 6.

⁷³ *Ib.* ii, 8, 1.

⁷⁵ *Ant.* xviii, 6, 10; xix, 5, 1.

⁷⁷ *Ant.* xix, 5, 1.

bestowed upon the son of Agrippa I, known as Agrippa II, the two tetrarchies of Philip and Lysanius;⁷⁹ and in the year 54, Nero, becoming emperor, added several cities named Abila, Tiberias, Tarichæa, and Julias,⁸⁰ with some fourteen villages.⁸¹ All the remaining territory continued provincial, governed by procurators, until the close of the Roman-Jewish war in A. D. 70, when the Jewish nationality was completely destroyed, and the whole land once more became Roman.

A SUMMARY.

1. An Undivided Kingdom, ruled by a native king of the Jews, known as Herod the Great.
2. A Divided Domain: an ethnarchy and two tetrarchies organized for Herod's three sons.
3. A Fractional Change: in the year 6, Archelaus's ethnarchy becomes a Roman province.
4. A Tetrarchy Reduced: in 34, Philip dies, and his tetrarchy becomes a Roman province.
5. A Reconstructed Kingdom: in 37, Agrippa I is made king over Philip's old tetrarchy.
6. Accessions to Agrippa I: he receives from Caligula, Antipas's Galilee and Peræa.
7. Additional Accessions: in 51, Agrippa receives from Claudius, Samaria and Judæa and Abila.
8. Kingdom Abolished: in 44, Agrippa dies, and his whole domain now becomes provincial.
9. A New Kingdom: in 53, Agrippa II becomes king over tetrarchies of Philip and Lysanius.
10. Accessions to Agrippa II: the Emperor Nero adds four cities and fourteen villages.
11. Jewish Nation Destroyed: in A. D. 70, the Jews were expatriated, and all becomes Roman again.

⁷⁹ *Ant.* xx. 7, 1; *Wars*, ii, 12, 8.

⁸⁰ *Wars*, ii, 13, 2.

⁸¹ *Ant.* xx, 8, 4.

THE EVIDENTIAL VALUE OF THESE FACTS AS REGARDS THE
FOUR GOSPELS.

The Evangelists make frequent reference to the rulers of the land, calling them properly by name, and sometimes even referring to a given realm; but they never pause to explain changes in the government, or what was the occasion by which rulers came to office. They invariably assume the political situation to be just as it was, and as it was understood to be by their contemporaries to whom they addressed their writings. To them no explanations were requisite. But this course would obviously be a most dangerous procedure for any writers to gain credence unless the Gospels were true. If true, the writers required no better security than the actual history of the times, upon which they evidently rested their case in open disregard for their own fame.

§ 285. The
Induc-
tions.

Upon the other hand, Josephus, a contemporary and a Jewish historian, not only corroborates the existing facts of the Gospels as assumed, but makes ample explanations how the political changes came to pass. Closely and carefully does he follow up the transitions in the political geography of the whole country, giving the order, the occasion and details respecting the changes in government, as well as the names of the rulers and their respective realms. So far from there being any conflict between the secular and the sacred writers, Josephus supplements the statements of the Evangelists. But these authors do not follow the same lines of history, as they have not the same ends in view. Josephus wrote expressly the history of the Jewish nation; the Evangelists wrote exclusively of the founding of Christianity.

It is fairly presumable that none but those living in the midst of such abrupt and stirring events leading to such apparent complications and transitions, could have composed

a true narrative of the times and touch upon the political situation without error. For if neither Tacitus, the Roman writer of fame who lived in the close of the first century, and wrote just after the Apostolic Age; nor Celsus, of the second century, who was the contemporary of the Apostolic Fathers, and wrote purposely to destroy the Christian religion; nor yet Dion Cassius, of the third century, and a contemporary of the Christian Apologists, who wrote his history in Greek, could really understand to unravel the governmental complications of the Apostolic Period—for they made grave mistakes, which they would not have made had they lived contemporaneously with the events they describe, and in the very land where they occurred—how is it that the Evangelists, simple in their character and unpretentious in literary fame, were entirely successful and inerrant in allusion to these events in writing the Gospels? This challenges critical consideration. There is but one answer: *They lived and wrote in the very epoch when the events themselves occurred in the current history, and hence were familiar with the facts which they record.*

The peculiarities arising out of the Roman and Jewish civilizations existing side by side—the one in domination, and the other in subjection, with all that that implies—is not the least important circumstance in proof of the antiquity and the historicity of the Gospels. The ingrained evidence is found in every fact, whether prominent or of minor mention, but especially the occurrences of incidental record, which thread through all the contents of those writings, as in the warp and woof of a fabric.

Besides these proofs of historical character, there is internal evidence imbedded *in the very words employed in the Gospels* illustrative of the two civilizations composing one community or State, as seen in the tri-superscription placed on the cross of Jesus. It is further demonstrated in the terms of usage in their laws, in the processes of their courts of trial, in the penalties they imposed for crime, in the designation of

the officers who inflicted punishments, and in the different modes of execution, as shown by Livy the Roman, and Josephus the Jewish historian. It is further found in their divisions of time, their different night-watches, their inclusive and exclusive dates, their fixed epochs according to the accession of chief rulers and high priests. It is also discoverable in the Augustan order for the enrollment of the Jews; a Roman requirement, but conducted in the Jewish method, which brought Joseph and Mary to Bethlehem in their tribal territory in exact fulfillment of prophetic prediction. The governmental history of that land during the first half-century of the Christian era is itself a monument in proof of the accuracy of the writers composing the several gospels, as well as of the period in which those writers lived and wrote.

No amount of reasoning can cancel these facts as unhistorical. Can any candid mind ignore the force of the facts? It is not in the power of genius to translate such facts into fiction, as is implied in the legendary and mythological theories of the Gospels. *Can all this detail, running through the contents of these sacred writings as verified, be true, and yet the record itself be false? Can a conclusion to the contrary be verified on the facts adduced?*

CHAPTER XV.

THE ROMAN RULERS OF THE JEWS IN THE
NEW TESTAMENNT.

α) CIVIL ADMINISTRATIONS: EMPERORS, LEGATE, PROCURATORS, PROCONSULS.

β) ROMAN ADMINISTRATORS RELATED TO THE HISTORY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT: THEIR CHARACTER, THE OCCURRENCES AND INCIDENTS OF THEIR ADMINISTRATIONS.

I. Emperors: Augustus, Tiberius, Caligula, Claudius, Nero.

II. Legate: Quirinius (Cyrenius).

III. Procurators: Pontius Pilate, Antonius Felix, Porcius Festus.

IV. Proconsuls: Sergius Paulus in Cyprus; Gallio in Achaia; and the "Proconsuls in Asia."

CHAPTER XV.
THE ROMAN RULERS OF THE JEWS IN THE
NEW TESTAMENT.

§ 286. Roman Officers of Palestine.

In reality it is altogether in minute points that the difference is to be perceived between truth and fabrication.—WHATELY.

Every quotation from Josephus, Tacitus, or Suetonius; every fresh archæological exploration in Palestine, Asia Minor, or Greece, only serves to illustrate this minute accuracy with which their titles are given to Roman procurators and proconsuls, Greek "politarchs," and Asiatic ædiles, and demonstrates the fidelity with which the dual system of government, of military forces, and of religious life, are described, as blended together and coexistent, side by side, at the only period when that coexistence was possible, among the strangest of all strange people, the Jewish nation.—MACLEAR.

The agreement to be traced between sacred and profane narratives is to be found chiefly, if not solely, in harmonious representations with respect to facts which, in the Scripture narrative, are incidentally mentioned as names, offices, and characters of political personages to whom there happens to be allusion. The value of such confirmation is not less, but rather greater, than that of a more direct confirmation, which would result from an accordance with main facts, because it is a task of extremest difficulty for any one but an honest contemporary writer to maintain accuracy in the wide field of incidental allusion; and because such exactness in such matters is utterly at variance with the mythical spirit of which according to [one] of the latest phases of unbelief, the narrative of the New Testament is the product. If it can be shown that the detail is correct, and the exactness that of persons intimately acquainted with the history of the time and bent on faithfully recording it, the [contrary] theory may be considered as completely subverted and disproved. It is important to bear in mind in this connection the fact that there is no period in the whole range of ancient history whereof we possess a more full and exact knowledge than we do of the first century of our era.—GEORGE RAWLINSON.

ARGUMENT.

That the Romans gained by conquest and maintained a political supremacy over the Jewish nation, in and after B. C. 63, is a fact which is thoroughly known in history. Thenceforth the two distinct and dissimilar civilizations coexisted side by side in one country and community, the Jews being held in subordination by the presence of the Roman army of occupation. Many striking coincidences occur in statement between sacred and secular narratives of these times, appertaining to the civic offices and ruling officers mentioned in the New Testament. This subordination and domination of the Jews could have occurred in but one definite period of time. If, then, it shall be found that, however incidentally the fact is mentioned, and that notwithstanding under the remarkable changes occurring in the government and in the political divisions of the country, the Roman rulers are all properly distinguished and placed in order, in the right period and division, if also events of prominence are correctly indicated as having occurred accordant with accredited secular history, then two inductions are logically inevitable: viz., that the sacred writers have given us an historical account of these public affairs, so far as they go, and that it is evident and obvious that the sacred writers wrote as contemporary with the facts recorded of which they had a proper knowledge. These inductions warrant the antiquity and historicity of these Scriptures.

- | | |
|--------------|-----------------|
| 1. Emperors. | 3. Procurators. |
| 2. Legatus. | 4. Proconsuls. |

From the characteristics of society in the Jewish land we pass to the consideration of its political Roman rulers. The emperors were the supreme heads of the empire, holding the office for life. Augustus, the first Roman Emperor, effected a division of the provinces between himself and the Senate. Those provinces which stood most in need of military force were retained by him, and ruled by those who were his exclusive appointments. They were administered by procurators or legates; the procurator had military power to govern when necessary, but the legate was a civic officer. A procurator had an indefinite tenure of office, while that of the legate was limited from three to five years. The more peaceful provinces

§ 287. Roman
Rulers and
the New
Testament.

were assigned by the Senate to government of proconsuls, who were civil officers, and whose tenure was for only one year. The inferior offices not mentioned in the New Testament have no place in this historical investigation.

EPITOME.

- I. EMPERORS: Augustus, B. C. 27-14 A. D; Tiberius, 14-37; Caius Caligula, 37-41; Claudius, 41-54; Nero, 54-68.
- II. LEGATE: Sulpicius Quirinius [Gr. "Cyrenius"], B. C. 4-1 A. D. and 6-11 as governor of Syria,* and Commissioner Extraordinary as Registrar of Palestine, in the second appointment.
- III. PROCURATORES: Pontius Pilate, A. D. 26-36; Antonius Felix, 53-60; Porcius Festus, 60-62.
- IV. PROCONSULS:¹ Sergius Paulus of Cyprus, 46; Junius Annæus Galio of Achaïa,† 53; "Proconsuls of Asia."

I. EMPERORS.

The emperors, whom the Romans called *Imperatores*, exercised a supreme and universal authority over the nations and individual subjects of the empire, claiming as their function the power of life and death, but also the right to extend that power to certain subordinates governing the provinces. ‡ The emperor was also invested, as chief pontiff or high priest, with the care of the religion of the State. In honor of the great Caius Julius Cæsar the first five emperors assumed as the imperial title, the family name "Cæsar," § which became extinct in Nero. To this title was added "Augustus," in honor of the first and famous Emperor

§ 288. The Imperial Rulers.

* *Legatus Augusti proprætor* in Syria.

† Achaïa, as the Romans called Greece in distinction from Macedonia and Illyria on the north. See Lewin's *Paul*, i, 269, 291, note.

‡ The Jewish Sanhedrin, a judicial body, seems to have been deprived of their power of life and death over Jews in Judæa, and this power was conferred upon the procurators of that province. Josephus says: "Coponius, one of the equestrian order, was sent as a procurator, having the power of death put into his hands by Cæsar." (*Wars*, ii, 8, 1.) The Jews confessed to Pilate: "It is not lawful for us to put any man to death;" and Pilate himself said to Jesus: "Knowest thou not that I have the power to release thee, and have power to crucify thee?" (*John* xviii, 31; xix, 10.)

§ Observe the German *Kaiser* for emperor, and the Russian *Czar*, a corruption of "Cæsar."

¹ *Ἀνθύπατος*, Acts xiii, 7; but sometimes called also *proprætor*.

of the Romans. Both titles are mentioned in the New Testament. Some of the emperors, such as Augustus, Trajan, and Hadrian, are considered to have been men of superior qualities and noble characteristics; but others, as Tiberius, Caligula, Claudius, Nero, Vitellius, and Domitian, the famous historian of the empire, Edward Gibbons, affirms "are condemned to everlasting infamy."

1. Augustus Cæsar was the first Roman emperor. He was nephew of the great statesman and warrior, Caius Julius Cæsar (B. C. 100–44). Augustus was born B. C. 63, and he was named for his father Caius Octavius, but subsequently assumed the name Caius Julius Cæsar Octavius. He, with Antony and Lepidus, composed the temporary government known as the Triumvirate. But the relations of the three became strained, and upon the retiracy of Lepidus, a struggle ensued for the supremacy between Augustus and Antony, which finally culminated in the naval battle at Actium, B. C. 31, when Augustus was declared to be Emperor by the Roman Senate. But as he now offered to resign this supreme power, they conferred upon him the title "Augustus."² This imperial name, meaning *august or revered*, was rendered in the Greek *Sebastos*,³ and was a title afterwards conferred upon his successors as a matter of heredity.⁴ Sometimes in history he is called Octavius. He possessed superior judgment and tact in the management of public affairs, and died A. D. 14, much honored and beloved.

The history of this great emperor comes in touch with sacred history by reason of his decree causing a registration of the population to be made in Judæa at the time of the nativity of Christ. Luke in his Gospel refers to him thus: "*Now it came to pass in those days, there went out a decree from Cæsar Augustus that all the world should be enrolled.*"⁵ It is a re-

² Σεβαστός, ("Augustus"), a title applied twice to Nero in the N. T.; viz., in Acts xxv, 21, 25.

³ Suetonius, *Augustus*, 7.

⁴ *Ib.* *Tiberius*, 26.

⁵ Luke ii, 1.

markable circumstance that this decree and the registration which it ordered brought to pass at Bethlehem, accordant with ancient prophecy, the birth of Jesus; for Joseph and Mary were required to go to Judæa, their own tribal territory, for registration, according to the Jewish method of enrollment.

2. Tiberius was the second Emperor of the Romans. About two years before the death of Cæsar Augustus he associated with himself his friend Tiberius, with a view to his becoming his successor to the crown. Accordingly, Tiberius was reigning when the Baptist was preaching in the wilderness, and also during the ministry of Jesus. Three allusions are made to this emperor in the historical New Testament. In the one instance he is mentioned by name, in the others by title. In fixing the date of John's ministry Luke says: "Now in the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius Cæsar . . . the word of the Lord came unto John, the son of Zacharias, in the wilderness."⁶ In the second instance, Christ's enemies asked him: "Is it lawful for us to give tribute to Cæsar or not?"⁷ And the third allusion to Tiberius was when Jesus was before Pilate, and the Jews shouted: "If thou release this man, thou art not Cæsar's friend; every one that maketh himself king speaketh against Cæsar."⁸ Thus near the beginning and middle, and at the end of Christ's ministry, a reference is recorded to this Emperor Tiberius.

3. Caius Caligula, the third emperor, is not mentioned or alluded to in the New Testament. Secular history, however, is replete with the narrative of his foul, despotic, desperate deeds. He insisted upon having his own statue set up in the temple grounds of the Jews at Jerusalem, that they should be compelled to accord him divine honors. In A. D. 41, says Josephus, Caligula

"Asserted his own divinity and insisted on greater honors to be paid him by his subjects than are due to mankind, . . . and had the boldness to call himself the brother of Jupiter."⁹ "He gave orders [to Vitellius, president of Syria] to make an invasion of Judæa with a great

⁶Luke iii, 1, 2.

⁷Matt. xxi, 17; Luke xxiii, 2.

⁸John xix, 12.

⁹*Antiquities*, xix, 1, 1; xviii, 8, 1, 2; comp. xviii, 8, 2, 7.

body of troops, and if they would admit his statue willingly, to erect it in the temple of God; but if they were obstinate, to conquer them by war, and then do it."¹⁰

The emperor, however, was finally dissuaded from his purpose by the influence of his special friend, Herod Agrippa I, who was a zealous Jew.¹¹ Caligula died by assassination.¹²

4. Claudius, the fourth and "feeble-minded" emperor, was fifty years old when he ascended the throne of Rome. He succeeded to the imperial office through the personal influence of Herod Agrippa I, who was the first to nominate him to the Roman Senate. It proved, however, that the emperor was governed by his freedmen. Suetonius says:

"Among his freedmen the greatest favorite was the eunuch Posides; . . . next to him, if not equal in favor, was Felix," who is mentioned in Acts xxiii and xxiv.¹³

Luke represents that Claudius became emperor at the time when Paul and Silas were making the second apostolic journey in Asia Minor and along Eastern Europe. This Evangelist refers twice to this emperor, and each reference has its historic interest. The first relates to the prediction of a great *famine*; the second to a certain *edict* of Claudius expelling the Jews indiscriminately from the Capital.

a) *The Famine*. Agabus, a Christian prophet journeying from Jerusalem to Antioch, "signified by the Spirit that there should be a great famine over all the world, which came to pass in the days of Claudius."¹⁴ It is not particularly important to the historicity of the fact or the argument based upon it whether this famine predicted was local or universal; whether the words rendered "over all the world"¹⁵ be taken in the extensive, or the restricted sense according to the *usus* of the Jews in Judæa; for it is clear that the Greeks also restricted this universal term to the Greek world, the Romans

¹⁰ *Antiquities*, xviii, 8, 2.

¹¹ *Ib.* xviii, 8, 7, 8.

¹² Suetonius, *Calig.*, 58.

¹³ *Ib.*, *Claud.* 28; comp. Tacitus, *Annals*, xii, 54; and Joseph. *Ant.* xx, 7, 1; *Wars*, ii, 12, 8.

¹⁴ Acts xi, 28.

¹⁵ Ἐσεσθαι ἐφ' ὅλην τὴν οἰκουμένην.

to the Roman world, and the Jews to the land of Palestine. In philological study it is of paramount importance that we apprehend the exact thought of the author. It is safe to assume that the term was employed in the restricted sense; for how could the brethren of Antioch have the "ability"¹⁶ to send relief to provision those at Jerusalem if they at Antioch were to be in the same strait? Nevertheless, a universal famine would harmonize all the historians on this subject, and meet the demands of the text in the most extensive sense. That the famine predicted by Agabus actually came to pass, is historically certain. We have not far to go for proof.

Tacitus records:

"A failure in the crops and famine consequent thereupon was regarded as a prodigy. Nor were the complaints of the populace confined to murmurs; they even gathered round the prince [Claudius] with tumultuous clamors while administering justice, and driving him to the extreme of the forum, pressed upon him in a violent manner; till at length, by means of a compact body of soldiers, he forced his way through the incensed multitude. It is certain that there was then in Rome provision for only fifteen days."¹⁷

Josephus states:

"Under these procurators [Cuspius Fadus and Tiberius Alexander] the great famine happened in Judæa."¹⁸ "A little before the beginning of this war, when Claudius was Emperor of the Romans, and Ishmael was our high priest, and when so great a famine was come upon us,"¹⁹ etc.

Eusebius adds:

"Caius . . . was succeeded by Claudius in the sovereignty of the empire. In his reign there was a famine that prevailed over the whole world; an event, indeed, which has been handed down by historians [who] were very far from our doctrine; and by which the prediction of the Prophet Agabus respecting the impending famine over the whole world received its fulfillment."²⁰

Orosius places this famine, so distressing in Syria, in the fourth year of Claudius.

¹⁶ Acts xi, 29, 30.

¹⁷ *Annals*, xii, 43.

¹⁸ *Ant.* xx, 5, 2; Fadus ruled 44-46; Alex. 46-48.

¹⁹ *Ant.* iii, 15, 3.

²⁰ *Ecl. Hist.* ii, c. 8.

From the foregoing history the following facts become evident, and confirmatory of the prediction of Agabus, and the statement of Luke; namely, that—

1. The prediction uttered by Agabus and recorded by Luke occurred about the year 44.
2. Josephus places a sore famine during the procuratorships of Fadus and Alexander.
3. Fadus came into office in Judæa after the death of Agrippa I, near the close of 44.
4. Orosius says the Syrian famine occurred in the fourth year of Claudius Cæsar.
5. The great famine certified by many historians, verifies the statement of Luke.

β) *The Expulsion.* The second reference by Luke to the Emperor Claudius was occasioned by the meeting of Paul with Aquila and his wife Priscilla at Corinth, who, though Jewish Christians, had been banished from Rome by the edict of Cæsar. It was about the year 52 when Paul

“Departed from Athens and came to Corinth. And he found a certain Jew named Aquila, a man of Pontus by race, lately come from Italy with his wife Priscilla, because Claudius had commanded all the Jews to depart from Rome.”²¹

Suetonius mentions the fact and the immediate occasion for the expulsion of the Jews from the Capital. He says of Claudius:

“He banished the Jews from Rome, who were continually making disturbances, Christ being their leader.”²² “He ordered that those who were banished from any province by the chief magistrate should be debarred from coming into the city or any part of Italy.”²³ Tacitus, however, in speaking of Claudius says: “For expelling the astrologers [miracle-workers?] from Italy, a decree of the Senate was passed, severe but powerless.”²⁴

Orosius places this edict in the ninth year of Claudius, which would correspond with A. D. 49 or 50.²⁵

Unquestionably, there were sharp disputations which arose

²¹Acts xviii, 1, 2. ²²Claud. 25. ²³Ib. 23. ²⁴Annals. xii, 52. ²⁵Hist. vii, 6.

between the Jewish Christians and the Jews of the old faith, about the keeping of the rabbinical law and about the accepted Messiah, Christ. But this discrimination between Jews seems not to have been made as yet at Rome. They were all expelled together as Jews, as a race, and not with respect to their religion. Nevertheless, Tacitus aptly characterizes these decrees as "severe but powerless." They were usually soon canceled, or not carried out. That Luke's reference to the expulsion is strictly historical, is made evident by the records of several independent and secular historians.

5. Nero was the fifth, and was the last, as he was the worst, of all the Cæsars.²⁶ He was born in A. D. 37,²⁷ lost his father when three years of age,²⁸ was adopted at eleven by Claudius,²⁹ and succeeded to the imperial purple when but seventeen years old.³⁰ For his education he was placed under the instruction of the famous philosopher and statesman, Lucius Annæus Seneca.³¹ His reign began well, but in a few years his character began to disclose itself in a course of unmitigated atrocities which he committed against the Capital, the senators, and the Christians and people. Tacitus says:

"While tranquillity reigned abroad, abominable licentiousness was exhibited at Rome in the person of Nero."³² "A rumor had become universally current at that very time, when the city was in flames, of Nero going on the stage of his private theater, and singing *The Destruction of Troy*, assimilating the present disaster to that catastrophe of ancient times."³³

But the infamies of Nero multiplied constantly, until at length the Senate openly declared him to be the enemy of the empire,³⁴ and the soldiery pursued him to the country as a refugee from justice, only to overtake him a wreck and a wretched suicide.³⁵ He died on July 11, A. D. 68. History fully verifies the sentence of Gibbon, who consigned the last four Cæsars to "everlasting infamy."³⁶

²⁶ Sueton. *Nero*, 6, and p. 385; *Vit. Galb.* 1. ²⁷ Sueton. *Ib.* 6. ²⁸ *Ib.* *Nero*, 6.

²⁹ *Ib.* *Nero*, 7. ³⁰ *Ib.* *Nero*, 8. ³¹ *Ib.* *Nero*, 7, 52. ³² *Annals*, xiii, 25.

³³ *Ib.* xv, 38, 39; Sueton. *Nero*, 38. ³⁴ Sueton. *Nero*, 49.

³⁵ Sueton. *Nero*, 49; Tacit. *Hist.* 1, 4. ³⁶ *Decline and Fall*, i, c. 3, p. 131.

In the New Testament several allusions are made to Nero, not by personal name, but by the imperial title "Cæsar" or "Augustus."* The Apostle Paul refers to him at least four times; thrice at Cæsarea, when he said, "I appeal unto Cæsar,"³⁷ and once in his Epistle to the Philippians when sending his special salutations "to any of the household of Cæsar."³⁸ Besides, there are four references made to this emperor by the Procurator Festus under the title of Cæsar or Augustus; and also once by King Agrippa II at Cæsarea, as recorded by Luke.†

In the statement then of what facts have these apostolic writings been vindicated as strictly historical by the citations of other authorities? The main facts may be summarized thus:

1. The imperial decree of Augustus Cæsar for enrollment, dates the nativity of Jesus.
2. The date of the Baptist's ministry, heralding in that of Christ, gives its chronology.
3. The conversation of Jesus with the Jews about the tribute money as lawfully Cæsar's.
4. The accusation against Jesus that claiming to be a king was speaking against Cæsar.
5. The prediction of Agabus of the famine realized in the fourth year of Claudius's reign.
6. The expulsion from the Capital City of all Jews by reason of continual disputations.
7. The one reference made by King Agrippa II to Nero as being then the reigning "Cæsar."
8. The four references to Nero as the emperor made also by the Roman procurator, Festus.

Here, then, are eight facts recorded by sacred writers respecting emperors and events touching twenty-one special

*"Augustus" descended as an imperial title to all the Cæsars from the first Roman Emperor, but some relinquished the title.

† See Acts xxv, 12, twice, 21, 25; and xxvi, 32.

³⁷ Acts xxv, 8, 10, 11. ³⁸ *Epis. to Philipp.* iv, 22.

points which have confirmation from secular historians whose writings cover the same period. All the facts fit in exactly in the proper order and chronology respecting the Roman rulers and their reign, as also the references to current events.

Are all these facts, personages, and references alike fictitious and unhistorical? If anything can be proved by historical evidence to a reasonable mind, the conviction becomes irresistible, and there can be but one answer to the question. Further, it is just as evidential and obvious that these writers—sacred and profane, the one class as much as the other—*wrote in those times within which they purport to have written.* Such evidence can not be set aside lightly, but is entitled to, and demands, as complete an explanation for our belief as is here given on the part of him who rejects the proof adduced and its induction—a *reason*, not mere *assertion*, not a speculation based on hypothesis or conjecture. but based on real historical grounds.

§ 290. II. Legate.

This officer was a civil functionary sent out from Rome by the emperor to govern a Roman province, and held office from three to five years. Quirinius was appointed twice to this office in Judæa for the purpose of making enrollments of the Jewish nation in the interests of the empire. In the first instance he numbered the population; in the second, he registered the valuation of property. The Evangelist Luke records a note of both registrations. Of the first, a census associated with the birth of Christ, he says: "This was the first enrollment made by Quirinius" in distinction from the second one mentioned by Gamaliel: "that there rose up Judas of Galilee in the days of the enrollment." The first enrollment occurred B. C. 4, and the second A. D. 10.³⁹ In the latter Quirinius is said to have been Commissioner Extraordinary.

³⁹ Luke ii, 2; Acts v, 37.

§ 291. III. Procurators.

A procurator⁴⁰ was a military ruler having charge of the imperial revenues, under the appointment of the emperor, with a life-tenure, unless recalled for cause. In rank the office was considered to be inferior to that of the proconsul and prefect. In the New Testament, as well as in the writings of Josephus, this officer is designated by the less strict and more generic title of "governor;"⁴¹ a term also sometimes applied to a proconsul. The procurator was invested with the authority to inflict capital punishment upon criminals; but for such infliction he was required to report the fact to the emperor at Rome, together with the circumstances which led up to the execution.*

The procurators mentioned in the New Testament are three in number; namely, Pontius Pilate, A. D. 26-36; Antonius Claudius Felix, 52-60; and Portius Festus, 60-62. These may be taken in the order of their official succession in the government of the province of Judæa. Any special circumstances occurring under their respective administrations will furnish subjects for critical consideration, and when found to be authentic, will illustrate the historicity and the spirit of those times.

I. PONTIUS PILATE.

In ascertaining points of accordancy between sacred and secular history, relating to this procurator, attention should be fixed upon three propositions to be verified; and of these—

* Eusebius says: "That nothing might escape him [the emperor], Pontius Pilate transmits to Tiberius an account of the circumstances concerning the resurrection of our Lord from the dead, the report of which had already spread throughout all Palestine." (E. H., B. ii, c. 2, p. 39.) Justin Martyr, in his first *Apology* appeals twice to these transmitted reports as then at Rome. He says: "That these things did happen, you can ascertain from the *Acts of Pontius Pilate*;" "And that he [Jesus] did those things you can learn from the *Acts of Pontius Pilate*." (*First Apol.* cc. 35, 48.) Tertullian adds: "All these things Pilate did to Christ; and now, in fact, a Christian in his convictions, he sent word of him to the reigning Cæsar, who was at that time Tiberius." (*Ante-Nicene Fathers*, Vol. III, c. 21, p. 35.)

⁴⁰ ἡγεμών, ὁ.

⁴¹ Inexactly ἐπιτροπος = ἡγεμών in the N. T. which is also a generic term for the office.

§ 292. 1. The Procuratorship in Judæa in the Time of Christ as an Historical Fact.

The historical New Testament makes several distinct affirmations relating to his government of the Jews, viz.:

“Now in the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius Cæsar, Pontius Pilate being governor of Judæa, and Herod [Antipas] being tetrarch of Galilee, and his brother Philip tetrarch of Itruræa and the region of Trachonitis, and Lysanias the tetrarch of Abilene, Annas and Caiaphas being the high priests [of the Jews], the word of God came unto John [the Baptist].”⁴²

“Now when morning was come, all the chief priests and elders of the people took counsel against Jesus to put him to death; and they bound him and led him away, and delivered him to Pontius Pilate the governor.”⁴³

“For of a truth in this city, against thy Holy Servant Jesus, whom thou didst anoint, both Herod and Pontius Pilate, with the Gentiles and the peoples of Israel, were gathered together.”⁴⁴

So far, three Evangelists witness separately, and all the apostles witness together in prayer. Luke’s statement is very remarkable for the web of circumstances which he weaves together in one brief paragraph, to authenticate historically the beginning of John’s ministry. Seven officers are named; each one is mentioned as a ruler of a given country; each country is designated correctly respecting its ruler,—the Romans in relation to their territories; the high priests in relation to their people. This extraordinary mention of concurring governments, all brought to view in one sentence to establish a single circumstance, is calculated to emphasize the fact conveyed as very important. Every particular brought forward exposes the Evangelist to a critical testing respecting its historical character, and if one should be found to be untrue, that fact would certainly impeach his record so far, and raise a presumption against the other particulars as questionable. Now, it should be accentuated that no writer would adventure to give all these details unless he knew them to be his-

⁴² Luke iii, 1, 2.

⁴³ Matt. xxvii, 1; Mark xv, 1.

⁴⁴ Acts iv, 27.

torical and that they would bear a critical examination by his contemporaries, and certainly no mythical or legendary writer could serve his purpose by descending to many details to substantiate a single fact by citing many; for that is the very opposite of the mythical spirit. It greatly accentuates the character of Luke as a critical historian that not one of these particulars has ever been questioned by a reputable writer, ancient or modern.

Among these particularizations it is stated that "Pontius Pilate was governor of Judæa" at the very time when John began his ministry. Matthew also makes reference to "Pontius Pilate the governor;" and Mark does not mention the office as such, but assumes its existence as understood, and then proceeds to relate many remarkable acts which the procurator performed as an officer of the Romans. When the apostles were dismissed from trial before the Sanhedrin, they met and reported to the other Christians all that had occurred; and then they voiced in prayer to God the fact, but connected the name "Herod" Antipas with that of "Pontius Pilate," of having something in common in the procedure against Jesus prior to his crucifixion.

Pilate's procuratorship is abundantly corroborated by both classic and Jewish historians. An appeal to the writers of the first and second century will be satisfactory. Tacitus records in a single sentence that which is conclusive on this point. It should be noted that he designates the several historical circumstances of time, place, and persons associated with two facts of paramount importance in this investigation; and all are related to the administration of Pilate, exactly as represented by the several Evangelists. He says:

"Christ, the Founder of this name [Christians], was put to death as a criminal by Pontius Pilate, procurator of Judæa, in the reign of Tiberius."⁴⁵ Josephus records that Tiberius "sent in" as procurator of Judæa, "Gratus and his successor in the government, Pilate."⁴⁶ "When

⁴⁵*Annals*, xv, 44.

⁴⁶*Ant. lib.* xviii, c. 6, §5.

Gratus had done these things he went back to Rome, after he had tarried in Judæa eleven years, when Pontius Pilate came as his successor."⁴⁷ "But now Pilate, the procurator of Judæa, removed the army from Cæsarea to Jerusalem."⁴⁸

Here are two historians of reputation—the one a heathen residing at Rome, the other a Jew dwelling in Palestine, contemporaries of each other, mutually confirming themselves, as well as the Evangelists, on the historicity of the statement that Pontius Pilate was procurator of Judæa in the reign of Tiberius Cæsar.

§ 293. 2. Prominent Occurrences under Pilate's Ruling as Narrated in the Gospels.

The points to be accentuated in the Evangelistic narrative are these:

a) The presence of the procurator at Jerusalem on the occasion of the Jews' great feast-days, and the special reason therefor.

b) The importance of the "tessellated pavement," incidentally mentioned, and its importance in the Roman administration of justice.

c) The presence of Pilate's wife at Jerusalem, at the trial of Jesus, contrary to the earlier requirements of the empire.

It was the established custom of the procurator of Judæa, whose headquarters were regularly at Cæsarea, to go up to Jerusalem to the high festivals of the Jews in order to prevent any disorder or tumult among the people. It is an unseemly reflection on the Jews that it was requisite for heathen rulers to keep the peace when the Jews assembled together to observe their own great annual and religious feasts. Josephus relates how a gang of ruffians known as the *sicarii*, so called from the daggers which they carried on their persons, were accustomed on those occasions to carry on assassination and plunder "in the midst of the city; this they did chiefly at the festivals when they mingled among the multitude, and concealed daggers under their garments with which they stabbed those who were their enemies."⁴⁹

⁴⁷ *Ant.* xviii, 2, 2.

⁴⁸ *I b.* xviii, 3, 1.

⁴⁹ *Comp. Ant.* xx, 5, 3; xx, 9, 3; xx, 8, 5, 6; *Wars*, ii, 12, 1; ii, 13, 3.

It was in accordance with this purpose to exercise authority, if there should be occasion, that Pilate was present at the Jews' passover at Jerusalem at the time when Jesus was crucified. For his official residence on these occasions, he took the palace of Herod the Great. To the courts of this royal residence the officers of the Jews conducted the Savior, after they had formally denounced him for blasphemy; but their ceremonial scrupulousness about defiling themselves as Jews excluded them from entrance into the palace to Pilate's presence, lest they should prohibit themselves from eating the passover.

"They lead Jesus therefore from Caiaphas into the palace [prætorium]; and it was early in the morning, and they entered not into the palace that they might not be defiled, but might eat the passover. Pilate therefore went out to them."⁵⁰

When the trial of Jesus had reached its crisis, Pilate proposed to execute Barabbas, and release Jesus. To receive their response to the proposal in a judicial manner, Pilate ascended the Bema, which was a tribunal erected before the palace, on an elevated piece of ground covered with a tessellated pavement. John relates that "when Pilate heard these words, he brought Jesus out, and sat down on the judgment seat at a place called the Pavement, but in the Hebrew Gabbatha."⁵¹

Now, the importance of the tessellated pavement in judicial procedures is remarked by both Roman and Jewish authorities. Suetonius mentions an instance in point in the case of Julius Cæsar, who "carried about in his expeditions tessellated and marble slabs for the floor of his tent."⁵² And also Josephus mentions this usage in connection with Herod Philip the tetrarch, as follows:

"His tribunal on which he sat in judgment followed him on his progress; and when any one met him who wanted his assistance, he made no delay, but had his tribunal set down immediately wheresoever he happened to be, and sat down upon it, and heard his complaint; he then ordered the guilty that were convicted to be punished, and absolved those that had been accused unjustly."⁵³

⁵⁰ John xviii, 28, 29.

⁵¹ *Ib.* xix, 13.

⁵² *Jul. Cæs.* 46.

⁵³ *Ant.* xviii, 4, 6.

Accordingly Matthew, referring to the occasion of Christ's trial narrates that Pilate—

“While he was sitting on the judgment-seat, his wife* sent unto him saying, Have thou nothing to do with that righteous Man, for I have suffered many things this day in a dream because of him.”⁵⁴

According to Seneca, in the earlier period of the empire, Augustus⁵⁵ was very strenuous in his policy requiring that magistrates, going to imperial provinces to govern, should *not* be accompanied by their wives—only allowing rare exceptions. In his biography of Augustus, Suetonius confirms the statement, restricting the exceptions to very peculiar circumstances. Yet as Tacitus writes, “How often did the deified Augustus [himself] travel to the east, how often to the west, accompanied by Livia!”⁵⁶ Nevertheless, Germanicus in Germany felt constrained to send away his own wife, that she might not “be exposed among the soldiers, infuriated and violators of everything held sacred by man.” Of this fact, Tacitus sympathetically remarks: “The wife of a great commander compelled to be a fugitive, and bearing an infant son in her bosom!”⁵⁷

Tacitus also relates that in the time of Tiberius, and in the year 21, one Cæcina Severus moved in the Roman Senate that “No magistrate should go into any province accompanied by his wife.”⁵⁸ But his proposition was promptly met with eloquence and urgent opposition, and was rejected finally with no little indignation. This disposition of the question settled the future policy of the government on that point, so that within five years Pilate is found to have entered upon office in Judæa *accompanied by his wife*, as Matthew states without explanation. It thus appears how that, on the occasion of our Lord's trial before the procurator a few years later, Pilate's wife sent her husband the strange and startling message: “Have

* Pilate's wife's name was Clauda Procula (Necepha, Eccl. 1, 30).

⁵⁴ Matt. xxvii, 19.

⁵⁵ *De Controv.* 25.

⁵⁶ *Annals*, iii, 33, 34.

⁵⁷ *Ib.* 1, 40.

⁵⁸ *Ib.* iii, 33.

thou nothing to do with that righteous Man!" This incident, of so exceptional a character, interwoven with the narrative of Matthew, without mentioning any circumstance leading up to the incident, without explanation why Pilate's wife was with him at Jerusalem, conveys the implication that the changed law was perfectly understood at the time, and incidentally attests the correctness and fidelity of the Evangelist's historical record.

§ 294. 3. The Discovery of Pilate's Character Accordant with Sacred and Secular History.

1. The first instance illustrative of the procurator's character for violence and vacillation was evidenced in his interview when Jesus stood before his tribunal a silent prisoner, charged with high crimes in an indictment by the Jews. Pilate questioned Jesus respecting his origin and his claims as King. It is stated that

"He entered into the palace again, and saith unto Jesus, Whence art thou? But Jesus gave him no answer. Pilate therefore said unto Him: Speakest thou not unto me? Knowest thou not that I have power to release thee, and have power to crucify thee? Jesus answered him: Thou wouldst have no power against me except it were given thee from above; therefore he that delivered me unto thee hath the greater sin. Upon this Pilate sought to release him." "When Pilate saw that he prevailed nothing, but rather that a tumult was arising, he took water and washed his hands before the multitude, saying: I am innocent of the blood of this Just Person; see ye to it. . . . But he scourged Jesus, and delivered him to be crucified!"⁵⁹

On another occasion, when Pilate undertook to force upon the unwilling Jews the ensigns of Cæsar, he evinced the same unworthy characteristics. Josephus records of him:

"Now Pilate, who was sent as procurator into Judæa by Tiberius, sent by night those images of Cæsar which are called ensigns into Jerusalem," which occasioned "very great tumult among the Jews" and loud protests "to preserve to them their ancient laws inviolable." "On the next day Pilate sat on his tribunal in the open market-place, and called to him the multitude as desiring to give them an answer; and then gave a signal to the soldiers . . . to encompass the Jews with their

⁵⁹ John xix, 8-12; Matt. xxvii, 24, 25.

weapons; so the band of soldiers stood round about the Jews three ranks [deep.]” “Pilate also said to them that they should be cut to pieces unless they would admit Cæsar’s images, and gave intimation to the soldiers to draw their naked swords.” But the Jews, casting themselves upon the ground, “exposed their necks bare, and cried out that they were sooner ready to be slain than that their law should be transgressed.”⁶⁰ Upon which Pilate was deeply affected with their firm resolution to keep their laws inviolable, and presently commanded the images to be carried back from Jerusalem to Cæsarea.⁶¹

Here at one moment is the threat of instant death, and in the next the offensive order is countermanded, illustrating that contradiction of character which always accompanies a base and weak mind—making such an issue with the Jews touching their religion, and when absolutely resisted unto death, ordering the detested images back to Cæsarea. Violence and vacillation in the presence of high moral courage are the evidence of a moral coward. And these characteristics were evidenced when Pilate, in the presence of the multitude, meekly washed his hands in attestation of Christ’s innocency which he had protested again and again, but immediately countermanded.

2. A second illustration of Pilate’s character relates to the occasion of enmity, and then amity, between himself and Herod Antipas. Luke relates:

“Now there were some present at that very season who told him of the Galileans whose blood Pilate mingled with their sacrifices.” “And Herod and Pilate became friends with each other on that very day; for before they were at enmity between themselves.”⁶²

The peculiarity of these two passages of Scripture is, that both purport to be narratives of historical facts; that both stand detached from any other written history; that both were written by the same writer; and that both are recorded in a manner which indicates the facts related were well known and unquestioned in the community where they are said to have occurred. Circumstantial evidence is strongly corroborative of these citations from Luke. Josephus states that “after

⁶⁰ *Wars*, ii, 9, 2, 3.

⁶¹ *Ant.* xviii, 3, 1.

⁶² *Luke* xiii, 1; xxiii, 12.

this, Pilate raised another disturbance by expending that sacred treasury which is called Corban upon aqueducts. . . . At this the multitude had great indignation.”⁶³ A strong feeling of resentment arose, which Pilate sought to repress in his own dark way, as he was wont. Soldiers clad in the garments of men in private life were armed with concealed weapons in their garments, and mingled with the multitude. He, himself, gave the signal, when the soldiers fell upon the people indiscriminately, cruelly causing many deaths,

“And equally punished those that were tumultuous and those that were not.” “Now, the Jews were so sorely beaten that many of them perished by the stripes they received; and many of them perished as trodden to death by themselves, by which means the multitude was astonished at the calamity of those that were slain.”⁶⁴

On another occasion Pilate, without any apparent provocation, ordered his soldiers to fall on the Samaritans.

“And when they came to an action, some of them they slew, and others of them they put to flight, and took a great many alive; the principal [men] of whom, and also the most potent of those that fled away, Pilate ordered to be slain.” “The Samaritan Senate sent an embassy to Vitellius, . . . president of Syria, and accused Pilate of the murder of those that were killed. . . . So Vitellius sent Marcellus, a friend of his, to take care of the affairs of Judæa, and ordered Pilate to go to Rome to answer before the emperor to the accusation of the Jews; . . . but before he could get to Rome, Tiberius was dead.”⁶⁵

A case in strong resemblance to the procedure of Pilate against the Galileans occurred under the rule of the ethnarch Herod Archelaus, who dreaded the influence of “Judas and Matthias, those teachers of the law,” upon the multitude assembling for the keeping of the Passover :

“Lest some terrible thing should spring up by means of these men’s madness, [he] sent a regiment of armed men, and with them a captain of a thousand, to suppress the violent efforts of the seditious, before the whole multitude should be infected with like madness.”

⁶³ Wars, 11, 9, 4.

⁶⁴ Ant. xviii, 3, 2; Wars, 11, 9, 4.

⁶⁵ Ant. xviii, 4, 1, 2.

The Jews, however, assaulted the soldiers so that the captain and many of the soldiers fled, and when they "had done thus, they returned to the sacrifices which were already in their hands." Thereupon Archelaus sent the whole army upon them and "slew three thousand men."⁶⁶

While there is absolutely nothing recorded in opposition to Luke's record of the report made by others to Jesus that Pilate had mingled the blood of the Galileans with their sacrifices, there is much to credit the statement by indirection. If there is not identity in the facts as narrated in sacred history, there is circumstantiality enough to justify the belief that Pilate was capable of just such a deed, in that his character is entirely accordant with the representations made. The following conclusions may therefore be legitimately considered:

1. That the Jews generally, and the Galileans particularly, were restive and tumultuous toward the Roman procurators, especially on the great festival occasions, due probably, in a large measure, to the cruel injustice which they had suffered at their hands, but particularly from the outrages committed against their religion by these political and heathen rulers.

2. That in at least one other instance under Archelaus, the Jews left their own altars and worship and drove away the soldiers, "when they returned to the sacrifices which were already in their hands." This clears the way and creates a measure of probability in favor of Luke's record of the report as authentic, inasmuch as the same affair would be attempted again, even though unsuccessfully, as in the case of those "Galileans whose blood Pilate mingled with their sacrifices." Pilate was not afraid to shed the blood of his subjects, provided he could make it appear at Rome that he was suppressing an uprising of the people.

3. Those Galileans were not the subjects of Pontius Pilate, procurator of Judæa, but of Herod Antipas, tetrarch of Galilee. Accordingly, any violence and slaughter of Herod's

⁶⁶*Ant.* xvii, 9, 3; *Wars*, ii, 2, 5.

subjects could not but be regarded as a high-handed outrage committed upon his people, but also was a deep affront offered to his government. Herod's principality was much inferior to Pilate's province in extent, in resource, and in population; and as recourse to war was not allowable without the imperial consent, and as Pilate had robbed Herod's subjects of their share in the sacred votive fund called Corban, which he had wrongfully appropriated to the public works at Jerusalem, these were just the kind of procedures most likely to engender "enmity" between these two neighboring rulers of the Jews.

4. But if there was occasion for enmity between them, there was also an occasion for amity. Now, it happened that Herod was at the passover at Jerusalem when Jesus was accused by the Jews before Pilate. When, then, Pilate had learned that Jesus belonged to that tetrarchy, he at once sent Christ to Herod as the proper judge of the case. This act in the procurator was doubly pleasing to Herod: (1) Because the action was an open acknowledgment of the principle that Herod's subjects were subject to Herod for their conduct, and not to Pilate; and (2) Because the sending of such a personage as Jesus to his presence, was extremely gratifying in itself, since,

"When Herod saw Jesus, he was exceedingly glad; for he was desirous to see him for a long time; and he hoped to see some miracle done by him." "And Herod and Pilate became friends with each other that very day; for before they were at enmity between themselves."⁶⁷

§ 295. II. Antonius Claudius Felix.

This man was not the second procurator of Judæa, but he is the second one mentioned in the Evangelistic history. And he is properly placed in the order of the "governors" of that country. He is named Antonius Felix by Tacitus, and is named Claudius by Suidas, but is mentioned simply as Felix both by Luke and Josephus. Originally, Felix was a slave of Antonia, the daughter of Antony and Cleopatra, and the

⁶⁷ Luke xxiii, 8, 12.

mother of Emperor Claudius. He assumed the name Antonius because he was the slave of Antonia, as he was afterwards of her son Claudius. Subsequently the emperor manumitted both Felix and his brother Pallas, both of whom became attached closely to the person of the emperor, became his chief advisers, and in fact, in a large sense, controlled the action of the feeble-minded chief during his reign.*

As procurator of the Jews, Felix occupies a conspicuous place in three chapters of the Acts of the Apostles. But in every case his name is mentioned incidentally in connection with the narrative of Paul's work and sufferings, which Luke therein has made the special subjects of his discourse. The first occurrence is in the order issued by Claudius Lysias, the military commandant of the castle Antonia at Jerusalem, which overlooked the temple and its courts. This order provides that the soldiers under him shall "bring him [the apostle] safe unto Felix the governor," whose residence was at Cæsarea-on-the-Sea; and he wrote a letter after this form: "Claudius Lysias unto the most excellent governor Felix, greeting."⁶⁸

§ 296. Historicity of Felix's Procuratorship.

Both the fact and the time of Felix's appointment as procurator of Judæa are circumstances well attested by various independent witnesses, who are even more explicit in statement than was Luke. It should be noticed, however, that Felix was twice appointed to this office in different parts of Palestine; once when he ruled conjointly with Cumanus in the government of Galilee, Samaria, and Peræa; and once when he had exclusive jurisdiction over Judæa. This will be clearly verified by the following testimonies:

Tacitus remarks: "Felix too, meanwhile, by applying unseasonable remedies, inflamed the disaffection, emulated as he was in his aban-

*Suetonius says: "Among his freedmen, . . . if not equal in favor, was Felix, . . . being entirely governed by these freedmen." (*Claud.* 28, 29.) Tacitus adds: "The Jewish kings being either dead, or their dominion reduced to narrow limits, he [Claudius] committed the province of Judæa to Roman knights or to his freedmen. One of these, Antonius Felix, wielded the scepter of a king with the soul of a slave." (*Hist.* v, 9.)

⁶⁸Acts xxiii, 24-26.

done courses by Ventidius Cumanus, who held part of the province; the division being such that Galilee was subject to Cumanus, and Samaria to Felix."⁶⁹ Josephus says: "After this, Cæsar sent Felix, the brother of Pallas, to be procurator of Galilee and Samaria and Perææ."⁷⁰

As respects the procuratorship in Judæa, Josephus adds: "Claudius sent Felix, the brother of Pallas, to take care of the affairs of Judæa."⁷¹ And Tacitus says: "Felix, for some time governor of Judæa, acted not with . . . moderation, but relying upon such powerful protection [as that of Pallas] supposed that he might perpetrate with impunity every kind of villainy."⁷²

In addition to these historical attestations, there exists an

§ 297. evidence incontestable in a coin struck under the
Numismatic authority of Felix, which is thus described:
Evidence.

"Obverse: a palm branch with the legend, 'Of Cæsar,' in the year 5; [*i. e.*] in the fifth year of Nero's reign [Claudius's successor], and therefore struck by Felix [himself] sometime between the 13th of October, A. D. 53, and the 13th of October, A. D. 59. Reverse: the legend, *Νερωος*, 'Of Nero,' within a wreath."⁷³

Thomas Lewin, Esq., in his famous work on *Paul*, says:

"Felix was certainly appointed in A. D. 52, and it is equally clear that Albinus arrived in the province as successor to Festus in A. D. 62. The portion, therefore, of this interval of ten years not occupied by Festus will represent the procuratorship of Felix. The events in the time of Festus were few, and would not require so much as two years. Festus died at the close of A. D. 61, and as prefects left Rome for the provinces on the 15th of April, the arrival of Festus in Judæa as successor to Felix may be placed about midsummer A. D. 60. Thus the procuratorship of Felix lasted from A. D. 52 to 60, a period of eight years, a tenure of office unusually long."⁷⁴

If, now, there be added to this period that in which Felix was procurator in Samaria, there is ample vindication of the truth in Paul's courteous remark: "Forasmuch as I know thou hast been of many years a judge unto this nation, I do cheerfully make my defense."⁷⁵

The material points substantiated by these evidences are these: That Felix was appointed procurator of Judæa as a matter of historical fact. This is shown by the testimony of

⁶⁹ *Annals*, xii, 54. ⁷⁰ *Wars*, ii, 12, 8. ⁷¹ *Ant.* xx, 7, 1. ⁷² *Ann.* xii, 54.

⁷³ Lewin, *Life and Epis. of Paul*, Vol. II, p. 121. ⁷⁴ *Ib.* II, p. 170, note 117,

⁷⁵ *Acts* xxiv, 10.

both Tacitus and Josephus, from both the Roman and Jewish side of history; also that he ruled Judæa from the years 52 to 60, as demonstrated by the coin struck by Felix during his procuratorship in Judæa, in the reign of Nero. The two procuratorships of Felix over the Jews more than justify the remark of the apostle—that Felix had been ruler of that “nation” for “many years” in the comparative and natural sense, since the usual period for the exercise of such authority had been but two or three years.

THE UNKNOWN EGYPTIAN IMPOSTOR.

An incident of very considerable importance occurred under the administration of Felix, which connects this procurator with the Apostle Paul in the account of the New Testament. While Paul was engaged in his spiritual devotions in the courts of the temple during his last visit to Jerusalem, he was seized and beaten by some of his Jewish brethren, but rescued by the Roman soldiery garrisoned at the castle Antonia, at the extreme northwest grounds of the temple. When the soldiers brought Paul into the castle, the chief captain said:

§ 298. The
Unnamed
Impostor

“Dost thou know Greek? Art thou not, then, the Egyptian who before these days stirred up to sedition and led out into the wilderness the four thousand men of the assassins? But Paul said: I am a Jew of Tarsus in Cilicia, a citizen of no mean city.”⁷⁶

The particular point to be observed is not Paul’s personal experience, but the inquiry of the chief captain Lysias as to a nameless impostor who figured as a prophet, called “the Egyptian,” whom Paul was supposed to be. That there *was* in fact such a character, who brought disaster upon a multitude of Jews, is made evident by secular and contemporary history. Josephus describes the man and his procedures with much circumstantiality in his different works. He says:

“There came out of Egypt about this time to Jerusalem one who said that he was a prophet, and advised the multitude of the common

⁷⁶ Acts xxi, 37, 39.

people to go along with him to the Mount of Olives, . . . that from thence he would show them how at his command the walls of Jerusalem should fall down; and he promised them that he would procure them an entrance into the city through those walls when they were fallen down." Felix "ordered his soldiers to take weapons, and he came against them with a great number of horse and footmen. . . . He slew four hundred of them, and took two hundred alive. But the Egyptian himself escaped."⁷⁷

In another history Josephus mentions this occurrence, adding merely that "the Egyptian fled, followed by only a few," and that "the greatest number of those that were with him were either slain or taken prisoners."⁷⁸

1. The first thing to be noticed is, that the incident of the adventure of the Egyptian impostor referred to by Luke is historical. It is interesting, if not remarkable, that both the chief captain and Josephus identify the notable false prophet as "an Egyptian." Josephus mentions him as "the Egyptian false prophet" who "came out of Egypt;" that others joined "with the Egyptian" in the "sedition," and that at the close of the battle "the Egyptian escaped." Lysias, the chief captain, also said: "Art thou, then, not the Egyptian?" Naturally he supposed that he had at last the escaped criminal in custody in the person of Paul, as he could not readily understand why the Jews otherwise should raise a tumult in their own temple grounds in the midst of sacrificial services, and assault one of their own brethren in that murderous way. But he soon discovered his mistake. Nevertheless, the coincidence of language by Josephus and the chief captain designating the place of the false prophet's nativity, is precisely that kind of language to be looked for as determinative of any case as historical.

2. It is contended, however, that Josephus and Luke are at variance as to the numbers led off in this sedition by the Egyptian. Josephus records that three thousand were led out into the wilderness, while Luke records "four thousand." A discrepancy in the estimate

§ 299. The
Case is
Historical.

§ 300. Discrepancy
Between
Authorities.

⁷⁷ *Ant.* xx, 8, 6.

⁷⁸ *Wars*, ii, 13, 5.

of the numbers does not vacate the fact. But it is to be noted carefully that it is *not at all Luke's* estimate, but that of *Lysias*, the chief captain; and the only responsibility of Luke involved is that of recording faithfully just what *Lysias* said in the premises. The discrepancy is exclusively between *Josephus* and the chief captain, and *Luke's* record remains unimpeached.

PAUL AND ROMAN CITIZENSHIP.

As matters now progressed, the chief captain proposed to know who the prisoner was, and prepared to make examination by exposing the person of the apostle to the torture of the rods, when Paul appealed to his rights as a Roman citizen under the law. The record is that—

§ 301. The Rights of Citizenship.

“When they had tied him up with thongs, Paul said unto the centurion that stood by, Is it lawful for you to scourge a man that is a Roman and uncondemned? . . . And the chief captain came and said unto him, Tell me, art thou a Roman? And he said, Yea. And the chief captain said, With a great sum obtained I this citizenship. And Paul said, But I am a Roman born. They then who were about to examine him [by scourging] straightway departed from him; and the chief captain also was afraid when he knew he was a Roman, and because he had bound him.”⁷⁹

The right of Roman citizenship involved personal freedom. It was in itself a proud claim of character entitling one to the consideration due to high dignity and position in society. It afforded immunity from burdens of the government, and conveyed claims which were sacredly secured and protected by law. Among other privileges, a citizen enjoyed full rights of property and control over his children and dependents; he had a voice in the assemblies of the people, and in the election of magistrates, and after his death his will was sacredly authoritative to dispose of property. For crime he was liable on condemnation to be beheaded; but he was exempt by law from bonds and imprisonment, from scourging and crucifixion. These punishments were reserved for slaves

⁷⁹ Acts xxii, 25-29.

and criminals, but were held to be too inhuman and ignoble to be inflicted upon a Roman citizen. It was a grave crime to impose such punishment upon a "Roman," and it is said that any magistrate doing so, rendered himself liable to the same penalty. This explains the fear of the officers in charge of the apostle both at Philippi and at Jerusalem, where his claim of citizenship was made and respected. The mere declaration, "*I am a Roman citizen,*" was deemed sufficient, and if falsely claimed, rendered the claimant liable to death. But exemption on this plea was available only in the presence of a Roman magistrate, and was not available before a Jewish authority. Hence the apostle says: "Of the Jews five times received I forty stripes save one."⁸⁰ At a Roman tribunal, a citizen was entitled to a trial by legal process; and the right of appeal from a provincial magistrate's decision to the Emperor of Rome was an inviolable right of a Roman citizen under the law.

The Valerian law (B. C. 508) disallowed strictly the *binding* of a Roman citizen; and the Porcian law (B. C. 300) forbade the citizen being *beaten with rods*. Cicero, in his *Oration against Verres*, speaks with much pride of the high claim and its lawful protection and immunities. He says:

§ 302. Citizen-
ship and
Roman Law.

"That exclamation, '*I am a Roman citizen,*' which often has brought assistance and safety among barbarians in the remotest parts of the earth."⁸¹ "Whosoever he might be whom thou wert hurrying to the rack, were he even unknown to thee, if he said that he was a 'Roman citizen,' he would necessarily obtain from thee, the prætor, by the simple mention of Rome, if not escape, yet at least a delay in punishment."⁸² With great indignation he says: "A Roman citizen was publicly beaten with rods in the Forum of Messina; during this public dishonor, no groan, no expression of the unhappy wretch was heard amid the cruelties he suffered and the sound of the strokes which were inflicted, but this: '*I am a Roman citizen.*'"⁸³

"The Porcian law removes the whips from the body of all Roman citizens." "The Porcian law takes away the liberty of a Roman citizen

⁸⁰ 2 Cor. xi, 24.

⁸² *Ib.* Act. ii, l. v, cc. 64, 65.

⁸¹ *Orat. pro Verrem*, lib. v, c. 57.

⁸³ *Against Verres*.

from the hand of the lictor.”⁸⁴ “It is a violation of the law that a citizen be bound; it is a crime that he be scourged.” “The cause being heard, many can be absolved; but unheard⁸⁵ no man can be condemned.”

In view of these noble principles of Roman judicature, then so well established and so generally understood, it was unquestionably a matter of painful surprise and alarm to the chief captain when he discovered that the prisoner in his custody, whom he should have protected by the shield of the law, was a Roman citizen, whom he had ordered tied up with two thongs to the whipping post with the purpose of scourging him as a criminal slave! A better insight into the embarrassing situation of Lysias in the castle of Antonia can hardly be furnished by written history. The very naturalness of the narrative is so impressive as to convey to the mind the conviction of its truth.

Claudius Lysias affirms that he had purchased his citizenship “with a great sum.” Was this transaction accordant with the history of the times? Tacitus mentions that in the times of Claudius (41-54),

§ 303. Citizen-
ship. How
Conferred.

“The census of citizenship [in the entire empire] was five millions, nine hundred and eighty-four thousand and seventy-two.”⁸⁶ Now, it is historical that, during the period of the empire, citizenship was conferred very freely and readily, and even capriciously; sometimes for a price, sometimes for a service, sometimes for merit. In some cases it was bestowed as a favor upon individuals; in others upon cities and even a whole province! Suetonius relates how that Augustus deprived some cities in alliance with Rome of their freedom, and rebuilt others which had been destroyed by earthquakes, or were deeply in debt.⁸⁷

“To those who could produce any instance of their having deserved well of the Roman people, he presented with the freedom of the Latium, or even that of the City [Rome].” Philo represents Agrippa I

⁸⁴ *Orat. pro Rabiro.*

⁸⁵ *Verrem*, v, 66, *Orat.* 5.

⁸⁶ *Annals*, xi, 25.

⁸⁷ *Augustus*, 47.

as saying to Caligula his friend: "You have enabled whole countries to which your friends belong to be citizens of Rome."⁸⁸ Suetonius mentions that Nero had "the Pyrrhic dance performed by certain youths, to each of whom, after the performance was over, he granted the freedom of Rome."⁸⁹ Dion Cassius states that Antony "collected money from private individuals, selling to some the right of citizenship, and to others exemption from taxes." "After this Claudius . . . took away the liberty of the City from many who were worthy of it, and, without any reason, gave it to others; sometimes to single individuals; at other times to a great number collectively. For the Romans, so to speak, having the preference over strangers, there were many who begged the citizenship of the emperor, and others who bought it of Messalina or of Cæsar's friends. On account of this, the privilege which formerly had been purchased at a great price, thereupon was rendered cheap by this reckless accommodation; so that even the story was invented that albeit, if a man should give to one as compensation pieces of shattered glass, he shall become a citizen."⁹⁰

These historical references and citations amply confirm the statement of Lysias in claiming to have purchased his citizenship at a great price; and of Luke, who, in recording the claim, wrote in accordance with the spirit of the times.

A different but a very material point touching the historicity of Luke's record is the case and claim of the apostle to being a Roman citizen by heredity: "But I am a Roman born." Facts shall speak for themselves.

Appian says: "Mark Antony gave liberty and immunity from taxes to Laodicea and Tarsus, and by special edict ordered that all citizens of Tarsus who had been captured and sold for slaves should be manumitted."⁹¹ Lucian mentions "that on the request of Athenodorus, a Stoic philosopher of Tarsus, and teacher of Augustus, the city was freed from tribute;"⁹² and Pliny adds "that Tarsus was a free city."⁹³ Conybeare and Howson say: "We have good reason to believe that at the period of the apostle's birth, the Jews were unmolested at Tarsus, where his father lived and enjoyed the rights of a Roman citizen. It is a mistake to suppose that this citizenship was a privilege which belonged to the members of the family, as being natives of this city. Tarsus was not a *municipium*, nor was it a *colonia*, like Philippi in Macedonia, or Antioch in Pisidia; but it was a free city (*urbs libera*) like the Syrian Antioch and its neighbor city, Seleucia-

⁸⁸ *De Virtue*, ii, 578.

⁹¹ *Appian de Bell. Civ.* v.

⁸⁹ *Nero*, 12.

⁹² *Works*, Vol. II, 473.

⁹⁰ *Hist. Rom.* ix, 17.

⁹³ *Pliny*, lib. v. 27.

on-the-Sea. Such a city had the privilege of being governed by its own magistrates, and was exempt from the occupation of a Roman garrison; but its citizens did not necessarily possess the *civitas* of Rome. . . . The family of St. Paul were in the same position at Tarsus as those who were Jews of Asia Minor, and yet citizens of Rome at Ephesus." ⁹⁴

"Rawlinson observes: "Citizenship by birth on the part of a foreigner might arise (1) From his being a native of some colony or municipium; (2) From a grant of citizenship, on account of service rendered to his father or a more remote ancestor; or (3) From his father or more remote ancestor having purchased his freedom." ⁹⁵ W. L. Bevan says: "The right once obtained, descended to a man's children." ⁹⁶ T. J. Woolsey adds: "Roman citizenship was most frequently acquired by birth; but for this it was requisite that both father and mother should be citizens. If a citizen married a Latina or a Peregrina, the children followed the status of the mother." ⁹⁷ Suetonius says, however, that Caligula restricted the privilege of citizenship by heredity to the sons; that the emperor declared that "none had any right to the freedom of Rome, although their ancestors had acquired it for themselves and their posterity, unless they were sons; for that none beyond that degree ought to be considered *posterity*." ⁹⁸

Josephus remarks that the Jews having been highly serviceable in Egypt, in the interests of Julius Cæsar in opposition to Pompey, Julius "honored Antipater very greatly and confirmed Hyrcanus in the high priesthood, and bestowed upon Antipater the privilege of a citizen of Rome, and freedom from taxes everywhere." ⁹⁹ "Two of the principal Syrians in Cæsarea persuaded Burrhus, who was Nero's tutor and secretary for his Greek Epistle, by giving him a great sum of money, to disannul the equality of the Jewish privileges of citizens which they had hitherto enjoyed." ¹⁰⁰ "Lucius Lentulus, the consul, freed the Jews that are in Asia from going into the armies, at my intercession for them." But the procurator Florus "whipped and nailed to the cross before his tribunal those who, although they were by birth Jews, yet were they of the Roman dignity, nevertheless." ¹⁰¹

Arrian says that "those who feigned to be Roman citizens were severely punished." ¹⁰² Suetonius affirms that Claudius "confiscated the estates of all freedmen who [falsely] presumed to take upon them the equestrian rank." ¹⁰³ "Those usurping the freedom of Rome, Claudius beheaded on the Esquiline" ¹⁰⁴—a place devoted to the execution of the worst criminals at the Capital.

⁹⁴ *Life and Epis. of St. Paul*, 1, 55, 56, Eng. ed.

⁹⁵ *Bamp. Lects.* 1859, Amer. ed. p. 398, n. 50. Lect. vii.

⁹⁶ *Smith's Bib. Dict.* "Citizenship."

⁹⁷ *Johnson's Cycl.*

⁹⁸ *Caligula* 83.

⁹⁹ *Ant.* xiv. 8, 1-3.

¹⁰⁰ *Ib.* xx. 8, 9.

¹⁰¹ *Ant.* xiv. 10, 13; *Wars*, ii. 14, 9.

¹⁰² "Qui jus Romanæ civitatis mentiuntur, graviter puniuntur" (cited by Biscoe).

¹⁰³ Sueton. *Claudius*, c. 25.

¹⁰⁴ "Civitatem Romanam usurpantes in campo Esquolino securi percussit." (*Claudius* 25.)

Thrice at least did the apostle claim for himself the dignity, the rights, and immunity of a Roman citizen, either outright or by necessary implication. In all instances the claim was respected and acted upon. The first claim was made at Philippi; the second at Jerusalem; and the third at Cæsarea. At Philippi he and Silas together were subjected to the twofold indignity of scourging and imprisonment in stocks; an outrage with the added aggravations that this was done to them without a crime, without inquiry, without a trial, before the open public, and upon the demands of an irresponsible and fanatical mob. Afterwards, when the authorities would privately rid themselves of their prisoners, Paul said to the officer in charge:

§ 305. Citizen-ship of the Apostle Paul. "They have beaten us publicly, uncondemned [by trial and sentence], men who are Romans, and cast us into prison; and do they now cast us out privily? Nay, verily; but let them come themselves and bring us out. . . . And they feared when they heard that they were Romans; and they came and besought them . . . and brought them out."¹⁰⁵

The conduct of the magistrate and officers is obviously a concession of the legality of the claim to citizenship, as well as a confession of the fact that they had been guilty of outraging the Roman law, and exposing themselves to the severest penalty. "The divine Augustus made a law that torture should not be applied"¹⁰⁶ to a citizen. "But arbitrary power often broke over this law, both at Rome and in the provinces."¹⁰⁷ The usual order to inflict punishment was terse, peremptory, and intensely Roman: "*Lictor, seize, strip, scourge!*"¹⁰⁸

Now, the interesting question arises: Why did not Paul plead at Philippi his citizenship at the first, and save himself the suffering and degradation of the scourge, as he did afterwards at Jerusalem? Neither the apostle, nor yet Luke, gives a single word of explanation. The reason must be found outside the sacred text.

¹⁰⁵ Acts xvi, 21, 22, 36-39.

¹⁰⁷ Rawl. *Bampt. Lects.* p. 399.

¹⁰⁶ *Digest.* 48, Tit. 18, § 1.

¹⁰⁸ "*Summove, Lictor, despoila, verbera.*"

Biscoe says: "The [Babylonian] Talmud explains this to us. It is thence abundantly evident that they [the Jews] were very backward to excommunicate the wise [men], the doctors, and the teachers of the law. If such committed crimes worthy of excommunication, they scourged them, but were unwilling to excommunicate them. . . . Scourging left no mark of infamy, nor any diminution of a person's dignity, so that the high priest himself was subject to this punishment. . . . Forasmuch as he [Paul] professed a subjection to the Jewish laws, it was in vain for him to plead this privilege [of citizenship]. The Romans allowed the Jews to use their own laws. Roman citizens themselves, if Jews, were to undergo the penalties prescribed by the Jewish laws."¹⁰⁹ Dr. Farrar's answer is to the following effect: "To have refused to undergo [scourging] by shielding himself under the privilege of Roman citizenship, would have been to incur excommunication, and finally to have cut himself off from admission into the synagogues." His proffer, then, would not have been "first to the Jew, and also to the Gentile."¹¹⁰

This answer is perfect when the apostle was in the hands of officers who were Jews; but is not applicable in his case at Philippi, or at Jerusalem, or at Cæsarea, where the magistrates or officers were Romans. Paul says: "Of the Jews received I forty stripes save one." Twice at Jerusalem Paul made this claim: "I am a Jew of Tarsus in Cilicia, *a citizen of no mean city.*" Afterward again Lysias asked in legal form, in reply to which the true answer must come: "*Tell me, art thou a Roman?*" The reply was an unqualified affirmation, "*Yea.*" In his letter to Felix, Lysias credited the claim as proper: "I came with the soldiers and rescued him, having learned that he was a Roman."¹¹¹

The third instance in which Paul claimed citizenship was when, under the accusation of the Jews at Cæsarea, Festus asked the apostle whether he was willing to go and be tried by the Jews at Jerusalem. His manly reply was:

"I am standing [now] before Cæsar's judgment-seat, where I ought to be judged. . . . If none of these things be true whereof they accuse me, no man may give me unto them. *I appeal unto Cæsar.*" Then Festus answered: "Thou hast appealed unto Cæsar; unto Cæsar shalt thou go."¹¹²

¹⁰⁹*Hist. of Acts*, 177, 178.

¹¹⁰*Life and Work of St. Paul*, Vol. I; *Excursus*, xi, p. 664. ¹¹¹Acts xxiii, 27.

¹¹²*Ib.* xxv, 10-12, 21.

No one but a citizen was entitled to appeal from a provincial ruler to the Emperor of Rome; but to such, the right was guaranteed by the Porcian, the Valerian, and Sempronian laws. No officer or magistrate could lawfully refuse to entertain the appeal; and after the word had been spoken, neither party could withdraw or avert the appeal. The grant is therefore the evidence that the appeal was just, and an official recognition of Paul's citizenship. Also King Agrippa II, who heard the appeal made and granted, admitted the claim when he said: "This man might have been set at liberty, if he had not appealed unto Cæsar." The appeal was entertained at Rome, when the appeal was duly heard. This was the final confirmation of the dignity claimed. Suetonius remarks of Augustus Cæsar:

"All appeals in causes between inhabitants of Rome he assigned every year to the prætor of the city; and where provincials were concerned, to men of consular rank, to one of whom the business of each province was referred."¹¹³

INDUCTIONS.

These several occurrences, happening under the ruling of the respective procurators of Judæa, serve to illustrate the internal history of the times, and confirm the statements concerning them in the historical New Testament. They evidence such a perfect acquaintance on the part of the Evangelist with the minutiae of these public affairs, that it is difficult to resist the conviction that the writer was writing from personal observation, and out of the times of these events. The following conclusions are therefore legitimated:

1. That the purchased citizenship for a great price, as claimed by Lysias, harmonizes with the facts and spirit of the times, as described by the historian Dion Cassius: "This privilege had formerly been purchased at a great price."

2. That it is in evidence that Jews were elevated to the dignity of Roman citizenship, not merely on the testimony of

¹¹³*Augustus*, 33, close.

Appian that Antony "gave liberty to Tarsus," and on that of Pliny that "Tarsus was a free city," but on the witness of Josephus that Lycius Lentulus discharged some of the army upon discovering that they were "Jews who were Roman citizens" in Asia; and further, that Florus crucified Jews "who were of the Roman dignity." These facts taken together warrant a powerful presumption favorable to the belief that Paul's ancestry resident at Tarsus were Roman citizens, and that Paul came into possession of that dignity by heredity.

3. That the apostle himself grounds this civic right upon the recognized principle of Roman law that he acquired it duly by inheritance: "I am a Roman born." That the right of this privilege by birth was inalienable in law was virtually conceded by Caligula, who limited the term "posterity" to the sons of citizens exclusively. Though otherwise acquirable, the most common method was its transmission by birth.

4. Paul's own claim of citizenship was not merely inferential, but it was positively affirmed again and again, and as often entertained and conceded. The magistrates at Philippi, Lysias at Jerusalem, Festus and Agrippa at Cæsarea, the entertainment of the appeal unto Cæsar at Rome, are so many proofs that the claim was just and right in law, and in the view of the officers of the law having the matter in hand.

5. That the historical character of Luke's writing is sufficiently attested. The internal evidence of his writing furnishes the best proof of his familiarity with the facts and incidents which he records; yet there is the witness of the several independent historians, writing in different countries, in different languages—Greek, Roman, and Jewish historians, who wrote near his own time—who powerfully confirm the historicity of Luke's record at all points.

§ 306. III. Porcius Festus.

a) *His Historical Character.* A knowledge of the procurator Festus is scanty. Nothing whatever is known of his history prior to his entrance upon his public office in Judæa,

where his death occurred before he had completed his second year of service. The only two sources of information are the writings of Luke and Josephus. These, however, are in accord in representing Festus as an historical man, and a just and upright procurator of the Jews in Judæa. In giving a narration of Paul, the Evangelist introduces Festus in an incidental manner:

“But when two years [of the apostle’s imprisonment at Cæsarea] were fulfilled, Felix was succeeded by Porcius Festus. . . . Festus therefore having come into the province, after three days went up to Jerusalem from Cæsarea,” etc.¹¹⁴

Three historical points are here involved: the identification of the person; the designation of the office; and his place in the succession after Felix. Josephus is equally explicit with Luke touching these particulars, but gives this added information, that Festus assumed government in Judæa in the reign of Nero. He says:

“Now when Porcius Festus was sent as successor to Felix by Nero, the principal of the inhabitants of Cæsarea went up to Rome to accuse Felix.”¹¹⁵ “Now it was that Festus succeeded Felix as procurator, and made it his business to correct those who made disturbances in the country.”¹¹⁶ “Upon Festus’s coming into Judæa, it happened that Judæa was afflicted with robbers,” etc.¹¹⁷

It is a noticeable circumstance that, in this brief record of the Jewish historian, Luke is confirmed in every point of detail. It is in order next to consider the principal facts and incidents which occurred under the administration of Festus with a view to their historicity as mentioned in the New Testament.

β) *Festus’s Use of “My Lord.”*

It is objected to Luke’s account as inaccurate that he inserts the expression “my lord” as the language of Festus in reference to the emperor, and that this expression was not in use during this period. The occasion was when Paul at Cæsarea was brought forth by this procurator and delivered his

¹¹⁴ Acts xxiv, 27; xxv, 1.

¹¹⁵ *Ant.* xx, 8, 9.

¹¹⁶ *Wars*, 11, 14, 1.

¹¹⁷ *Ant.* xx, 8, 10.

famous address before King Agrippa II and the chieftains and dignitaries of the city. In introducing his distinguished prisoner, Festus said:

“I found that he had committed nothing worthy of death; and as he himself appealed to the emperor I determined to send him. Of whom I have no certain thing to write unto my Lord.”¹¹⁸

But it is evident that this title was applied to the emperor as early as the time of Augustus, for Suetonius says:

“He always abhorred the title of lord as ill-omened and offensive. And when in a play performed at the theater at which he was present, these words were introduced, ‘*O just and gracious Lord,*’¹¹⁹ and the whole company with joyful acclamations testified their approbation of them as applied to him, he instantly put a stop to their indecent flattery by waving his hand and frowning sternly; and the next day publicly declared his displeasure in a proclamation. He never afterwards would suffer himself to be addressed in that manner, even by his own children or grandchildren, either in jest or earnest; and he forbade them the use of all such complimentary expressions to one another.”

Suetonius mentions the disapproval by Tiberius, the successor of Augustus, in regard to this title. He says: “Being once called ‘lord’ by some person, he desired that he might no more be affronted in that manner.”¹²⁰ Tacitus cites an instance in which he “sharply rebuked such as said ‘his divine occupations,’ and called him ‘Lord.’”¹²¹ Now, the fact that both these emperors repudiated the title, proves *that the title had been used*. Josephus also mentions “a sect” of pharisaic philosophers whom he represents as saying that—

“God is to be their only ruler and Lord, . . . nor can any fear make them call any man Lord; and since this immovable resolution of theirs is well known, I will speak no further about the matter.”¹²² “Now Caius Cæsar did so grossly abuse the fortune he had arrived at as to take himself to be a god.”¹²³ “He also asserted his own divinity, and insisted on greater honors to be paid him by his subjects than are due to mankind.”¹²⁴

¹¹⁸ Τι γράψαι τω κύριω οὐκ ἔχω, Acts xxv, 26.

¹¹⁹ “*O Dominum æquum et bonum,*” Augustus, c. 53.

¹²¹ Annals, ii, 87; Josephus, Wars, ii, 10, 4.

¹²² Wars, ii, 10, 1, 4.

¹²⁰ Tiberius, c. 27.

¹²³ Ant. xviii, 1, 6.

¹²⁴ Ant. xix, 1, 1.

Philo's companions, delegated to represent the Jews' grievances to the emperor at Rome, called him "lord." Pliny addressed his official letters to Trajan, and Fronto addressed his to Marcus Aurelius, with the title "my lord." Dion Cassius mentions Nero as appearing clad as an actor in the theater, saying: "Do you hear me favorably, my lords."¹²⁵ Domitian dictated as the form of letters to be addressed to his procurators: "Our Lord and God commands so and so; whence it came to be the rule, that no one should style him otherwise in writing or speaking."¹²⁶ Seneca refers to his own brother "the deputy of Achaïa," as "my Lord Gallio."¹²⁷ Thomas Lewin says: "Caligula was greedy of it [the title]; and it seems to have been assumed by his successors till the reign of Domitian [A. D. 81-96], when it was assigned to the emperors by law."¹²⁸

In the presence of such historical evidence, there ought to be no question of the Evangelist's accuracy; a characteristic which extends to the minutest detail in his narration.

§ 307. IV. Proconsuls.

The mention of proconsuls in the New Testament is limited to the Book of Acts. There are but three instances, but each is historically exact. These are (1) "The proconsul Sergius Paulus, a man of understanding,"¹²⁹ who was converted to the Christian faith under the ministry of Paul, during his first missionary journey, at Paphos in the island Cyprus, where he was resident and the ruler of the island. (2) "When Gallio [Seneca's brother] was proconsul of Achaïa,"¹³⁰ who refused to entertain a charge brought against Paul, because it was merely a matter of the Jews' religion." (3) "The courts are open, and there are proconsuls;"¹³¹ a statement made by the town clerk at Ephesus, who was registrar of the city.

¹²⁵ *Hist. Rom.* 1, 1x1, 20.

¹²⁶ *Kύριος* and *Dominus* were equivalents in inscriptions. See President Woolsey's art. "Festus" in *Smith's Bib. Dict.*

¹²⁷ Seneca said of his brother: "*Illud mihi in ore erat Domini mei Gallionis;*" comp. *Epis.* 104 with Acts xxv, 26.

¹²⁹ Acts xiii, 7.

¹³⁰ *Ib.* xviii, 12.

¹³¹ *Ib.* xix, 38.

“And when they had gone through the whole island unto Paphos, they found a certain sorcerer, a false prophet, a Jew whose name was Bar-Jesus, who was with the pro- §308. Paulus
consul Sergius Paulus, a man of understanding. The the
same called unto him Barnabas and Saul, and sought Proconsul.
to hear the word of God.”¹³²

Paphos was a city located on the extreme west end of the island, Cyprus. The apostles Barnabas and Paul, starting from Antioch in Syria, were making together their first missionary journey; and this was the second station where they stopped in their work. Luke remarks incidentally that the ruler Sergius Paulus was a “sagacious” or a “shrewd man.”¹³³ In former times scholarly minds found much difficulty in reconciling the facts with the statement of Luke touching Paulus being proconsul at this time; and even Grotius came to believe that the Evangelist had erred in designating Cyprus as governed by a proconsul by the appointment of the Senate, when at the very first Augustus had made it an imperial province. Nevertheless, time and investigation have developed the exactness of the Evangelist’s statement.

It is true that in the original partition of the provinces, Cyprus was imperial; but Dion Cassius relates that afterwards an exchange was effected in which Dalmatia was taken by the emperor, and Gallia Narbonensis and Cyprus were transferred to the Roman Senate. Thus Cyprus became proconsular, and Sergius Paulus became the proconsul. And what lends interest to the circumstance is the fact that this exchange was effected but a few years before Luke wrote the Book of Acts. Since the exchange of provinces was thoroughly understood by contemporaries, it was not needful that Luke should make any explanation. He was not writing to explain the condition of the country, but to state known facts concerning it.

Incontestable evidence of the correctness of this conclusion has been discovered in the red copper coins from native mines in that region in Citium and Curiam, bearing inscriptions

¹³² Acts xiii, 6, 7, 12.

¹³³ *Ιδ.* xiii, 7, ἀνδρὶ συνετῷ.

relating to this very period, ascribing proconsular functions to Cominius Proculus, Julius Cordus, and L. Aunus Bassus. Besides, the strict exactness of Luke is conclusively attested by a coin struck under the Emperor Claudius, when Cominius Proculus was proconsul, who is understood to have immediately succeeded Sergius Paulus in Cyprus. The coin bears on the obverse side an image of the head of Claudius, and on the reverse side the superscription:

§ 309. Proofs
from
Coins.

“Of the Cyprians. Under Cominius Proculus, Proconsul.”¹³⁴

This is conclusive proof that Cyprus was proconsular about this time. Another inscription of recent discovery exists in the Cesnola’s Cyprus in these words:

“In the Rule of Paulus, Proconsul.”¹³⁵

This is conclusive proof respecting Sergius Paulus being proconsul of Cyprus. These perpetual evidences, like monuments, settle critically and permanently any reasonable doubt as to the authentic and authoritative statements of Luke respecting Sergius Paulus as proconsul of Cyprus.

In describing an incident in Paul’s ministry Luke states: “But when Gallio was proconsul of Achaïa, the Jews with one accord rose up against Paul and brought him before the judgment seat.”¹³⁶ To substantiate the historical character of this proconsulship is somewhat difficult owing to the numerous changes to which it was subjected about this period. Originally, Augustus assigned it to the Roman Senate, and it was governed by a proconsul. His successor, Tiberius, upon the request of the people interested, placed Achaïa with the emperor, and ruled it by a procurator. Tacitus wrote: “The province of Achaïa

§ 310. Gallio
of
Achaïa.

¹³⁴ *Eckhel*, iii, 84; Morell’s *Thes. Numis. Illustr.* 39, 42.

¹³⁵ ΕΗΙ ΠΑΤΑΟΥ [ΑΝΘ]ΗΗΑΤΟΥ. See, further, Bishop Lightfoot in *Contemporary Review* for May 1873, and *Essays*, p. 294; also Salmon’s *Introd. to the N. T.* chap. xviii, pp. 321, 322, note.

¹³⁶ Acts xviii, 12.

and Macedonia praying relief from public burdens, were for the present discharged of their proconsular government, and transferred to Tiberius."¹³⁷ Then in the fourth year of his reign Claudius restored the province to the Senate, and it was again governed by a proconsul. Suetonius says of Claudius: "He gave up to the Senate the provinces of Achaïa and Macedonia which Tiberius had transferred to his own administration."¹³⁸

Now, Paul was brought before Gallio at Corinth about the year 53, and Claudius reigned A. D. 41-54. Pausanias, Suetonius, and Dion Cassius agree that the province was already then existent, in the close of Claudius's reign. His successor, Nero, soon after that made the Greeks free, and the Senate then lost the province altogether. It thus came to pass as stated by Dr. Salmon: "Under Tiberius, Achaïa was imperial; under Nero it was independent; under Claudius it was senatorial, as represented by St. Luke. In Ephesus the mention of ἀνθύπατοι [*i. e.*, proconsuls] (Acts xix, 38) is equally correct."¹³⁹

It was, then, during this last proconsular period, and not long before the province was finally dissolved, that Paul appeared before the tribunal of Gallio, who refused to entertain a charge against him on the score of his religion.¹⁴⁰ By reason of these frequent transfers of the province of Achaïa between emperor and Senate, it would have been more than difficult for any writer living in a subsequent century or two to furnish an exact history of the political condition of the country in detail during those times. Ample proof of this is furnished in the case of several classical writers of fame who lived remote from the country or the times, but attempted to give an historical account of the political situation of the period, and made egregious errors both with respect to

¹³⁷ *Annals*, 1, 76.

¹³⁸ *Claudius*, 25.

¹³⁹ *Introd. N. T.* 322. See Tacit. *Annals*, 1, 76; Sueton. *Claudius*, 25.

¹⁴⁰ Acts xviii, 14-16.

historical facts and the titles of the rulers of the land, as is demonstrated by Pitiscus in his notes on Suetonius's *Twelve Cæsars*, and Cardinal Norisius in his *Cenotaphium Pisanum*,¹⁴¹ as well as in the writings of Tacitus and Celsus. Upon the contrary, Luke has written out of the times, without any apparent consciousness of difficulty or embarrassment, without hesitation or explanation, without strain or affectation; entering into details in a most natural way, recounting scenes which stand before the mind like life-pictures, having in them the interest and glow of reality, and going before the world with a brief record which has proved to be of inerrant correctness, to which every new discovery has given a fresh affirmation and confirmation. Such exactness in details is incompatible with the spirit of mythological or legendary writings. Luke's carefulness in historical narrative is something wonderful; and the easy flow of his style and his natural handling of facts are such as become almost self-evident of the authenticity and credibility of the things which he narrates.

"If therefore Demetrius and the craftsmen that are with him have a matter against a man, the courts are open, and §311. The Pro- there are proconsuls."¹⁴² "The town-clerk"¹⁴³ consuls of Asia. was originally a scribe or secretary, who was the custodian of the laws, and the public reader of the decrees of Greece; but in Asia Minor he was a magistrate, who was the chief of a municipal government.¹⁴⁴ In the Hebraistic sense of the term, he was simply a man of learning.¹⁴⁵ In the passage cited, the magistrate of Ephesus meant "The courts of law are held [for civil action], and there are proconsuls [for the trial of criminal causes]." The case presents no difficulty; but it illustrates the Evangelist's accuracy as an historical writer.

¹⁴¹Biscoe on Acts, p. 89.

¹⁴² Ἀγοραῖοι ἄγονται καὶ ἀνθύπατοι εἰσιν, Acts xix, 88.

¹⁴³ Γραμματεὺς.

¹⁴⁴Alford, *Greek Testament*, in loco.

¹⁴⁵Smith's *Bib. Dict.*, Vol. IV, p. 3315. See Thayer's *Greek Dictionary of the New Testament*.

These are the only references to proconsuls in the New Testament.

This chapter has been occupied with the historical investigation of the existence, character, and procedures of the Roman rulers of Judæa—emperors, legate, procurators, and proconsuls—and the chief facts and incidents occurring under their respective administrations, so far as they are alluded to in the historical part of the New Testament. The emperors are five in number,—Augustus, Tiberius, Caligula, Claudius, and Nero. Quirinius is the one legate whose first tenure of office marks the date of the Nativity of Christ, and the correct date for the beginning of the Christian era as that now known as B. C. 4. The procurators are three in number,—Pilate, Felix, and Festus. The proconsuls are two,—Sergius Paulus of Cyprus, Gallio of Achaïa; and others unnamed, but designated as “proconsuls in Asia.” These officers of the government of Judæa, whose procedures are interwoven with the history in the New Testament, have been found to be strictly historical in every particular. Chief facts and events; such as, the predicted famine of Agabus; the expulsion of the Jews from Rome; the historicity of the Egyptian impostor; the Roman citizenship of Tarsus and Paul; the law protecting a citizen from the punishment of scourging; the conversion of Sergius Paulus; the deliverance of Paul by Gallio at Achaïa,—these, and many other circumstances of like importance, are fully established by history. There are, besides, minor facts but casually mentioned; such as, the presence of the procurator at Jerusalem on the national feast-days of the Jews; the importance attached to the tessellated pavement in matters of Roman judicature; the law, and Pilate’s wife being at Jerusalem when Jesus underwent examination before Pilate; Lysias and his purchased citizenship; Festus and the usus of the expression “my lord,”—these, and many other matters of incidental mention in the

§ 312. Summary and Induction.

Scriptures, are minutiaë verified both chronologically and historically.

Can all such particularizations respecting facts, great and small, be found incorporated into the very warp and woof of a given narrative and be true, and the narrative yet be false? Can historical evidence go farther in establishing and verifying any occurrences or facts of the ancient past?

CHAPTER XVI.

THE JEWISH RULERS OF THE JEWS: HOUSE OF
THE HERODS.

I. FIRST GENERATION OF THE HERODIAN RULERS.

Herod the Great: King.

II. SECOND GENERATION OF THE HERODIAN RULERS.

1. *Herod Archelaus: Ethnarch.*

2. *Herod Antipas: Tetrarch.*

3. *Herod Philip II: Tetrarch.*

III. THIRD GENERATION OF THE HERODIAN RULERS.

Herod Agrippa I: King.

IV. FOURTH GENERATION OF THE HERODIAN RULERS.

Herod Agrippa II: King.

V. THE SEVERAL HERODIAN PRINCESSES:

1. *The Princess Herodias.*

2. *The Princess Bernice.*

3. *The Princess Drusilla.*

CHAPTER XVI.

JEWISH RULERS OF THE JEWS: HOUSE OF THE HERODS.

§ 313. Jewish Rulers of the Jews, and the New Testament.

Historical evidence, like judicial evidence, is founded on the testimony of credible witnesses. . . . As all *original witnesses* must be contemporary with the events which they attest, it is a necessary condition for the credibility of a witness that he be a contemporary. . . . Unless, therefore, an historical account can be traced by probable proof of the testimony of contemporaries, the first condition of historical credibility fails. Accounts . . . derived directly or *indirectly* from the reports of original witnesses . . . may be considered as presumptively entitled to credit.—SIR G. C. LEWIS.

When the writing which we possess is the writing of a contemporary, supposing that it is a credible witness and had means of observing the facts to which he testifies, the fact is to be accepted as possessing the first degree of credibility.—GEORGE RAWLINSON.

It would be impossible to point out any similar period of fifty years in English history marked by so many changes; and it would not have been surprising if, supposing them to have been merely ordinary writers, those who compiled the narratives contained in the New Testament, had evidenced such a sense of difficulty and hesitation in the face of political changes, so intricate and so anomalous. But is this what we find? On the contrary, the writers of the New Testament nowhere betray any sense of perplexity. They mark quite incidentally and without the slightest trace of strain or effort the various phases, extraordinary as they were, in the civil government of Palestine.—G. F. MACLEAR.

ARGUMENT.

For more than a century the house of the Herods furnished the Jewish rulers of the Jews. For five generations the Herodian princes were imperially invested by the Romans with the place and power of government in this country. The particular epoch, however, which interests this discussion is that covered by the first fifty years of the Christian era.

Each prince of this ruling family is recognized in the New Testament, in his proper place and character; and every princess

of the household is known and correctly named and represented in accordance with the facts and testimony of accredited secular history. That which gives an added interest to these notices is the fact that each prince and princess is brought forward on some special occasion, when the personage appeared in some special relation to Jesus Christ or one of his apostles; and the Evangelists introduce in briefest and most casual terms the princely one in connection with some new turn in the course of events narrated. The question whether the sacred writers were errant in applying the title "King" to a mere ethnarch or a tetrarch will receive critical attention in its proper place.

These facts, taken in connection with others, legitimate the induction that the sacred writers were the contemporaries of the Herods, and were perfectly familiar with the internal government and current history of the land during the first fifty years of the Christian era, and with the unparalleled changes and complications of a political character which occurred in that period. The very casual and incidental manner in which persons and occurrences are mentioned, makes powerfully for the authenticity of the sacred writings, and are of such a character as to render a contrary conclusion not only uncritical, but absolutely irrational.

1. Herod the Great—King.
2. Herod Archelaus—Ethnarch.
3. Herod Antipas—Tetrarch.
4. Herod Philip II—Tetrarch.
5. Herod Agrippa I—King.
6. Herod Agrippa II—King.

The historical inquiry now passes from the Roman rulers of the Jews in Judæa to *the Jewish rulers of the Jews under the princes of the house of the Herods*. The Romans and Jews alternated at different times in the government of the country. Tacitus is authority for the statement that, in the year 63 or 64 B. C., "Pompey was the first Roman that subdued the Jews."¹ From this time forth the domination of the conquerors became gradually more and more severe and cruel, until the exasperating despotism of the Roman procurators incited a universal revolt of the Jews, the suppression of which issued in the utter extinction of the Jewish nation, the burning of their temple, and the expatriation of the people, in the year 70. An interesting field

§ 314. A
Preliminary
Notation.

¹ *History*, v, 9.

for investigation is here opened respecting the Herods, the Jewish rulers who were placed in power by the Romans, and a wealth of incidents which occurred in the first half-century of the Herodian reign finds frequent allusions in the historical New Testament. The nameless complications and perplexities arising therefrom, to the subjects of civil government, consequent upon the sudden and numerous changes of rulers and territory during that period, have already passed under review.² This chapter is interested principally in the *personnel* of these rulers, especially at points where the history of their reign overlaps the sacred narrative.

I. THE FIRST GENERATION OF THE HERODS.

HEROD THE GREAT (B. C. 47-4).

Antipater was the father of Herod the Great, and was much in favor with the Roman Government. Julius Cæsar, in the year B. C. 47, appointed the father procurator §315. Origin of Judæa.³ He was of Idumæan stock, better of Herod. known as an Edomite, a descendant of Esau.⁴ John Hyrcanus, having conquered the Idumæans, brought them into the Judæan Government, and, conforming to the requirements of the Jewish circumcision, they embraced the Jewish religion. But they were always regarded with prejudice and suspicion by the Jews, who styled the Idumæans but "half-Jews."⁵ They occupied a southern district lying between the Mediterranean and the Dead Sea and southward, a country known as *Nageb*. Herod was the second son of Antipater and his Arabian wife Cypros, who was of noble blood.⁶

About the time of the father's appointment to the procuratorship of Judæa, Herod was made "procurator of all Syria," with the promise that he should be made "king of Judæa;"⁷ and his father "committed Galilee to Herod" "when he was

² See chapter xiv.

³ *Ant.* xiv, 8, 5. ⁴ *Ib.* xiv, 8, 5; *Wars*, 1, 10, 3; *Smith's Bib. Dict.*: "Idumæans."

⁵ *Ant.* xiii, 9, 1; *Ant.* xiv, 15, 2; xx, 8, 7. ⁶ *Ib.* xiv. 7, 3; *Wars*, 1, 8, 9. ⁷ *Ib.* i, 11, 4.

but fifteen years of age"⁸—probably twenty-five is here meant. In 41 B. C., Mark Antony "made both Herod and Phasælus [his elder brother] tetrarchs, and committed the public affairs to them;"⁹ and during the next year the Parthians invaded his dominions in favor of Antigonus, the Asmonean rival of Herod, and the rightful heir apparent to the throne, when Herod fled to Rome for help.¹⁰ Tacitus records that "Herod was placed on the throne by Mark Antony, and Augustus [Cæsar] enlarged his privileges."¹¹ But Herod could not assert his royal privileges and rights over Palestine until, with the help of the Romans, he had captured Jerusalem in the year 37 B. C. Nevertheless his coronation and enthronement were made an occasion of great magnificence by Cæsar.¹² Josephus relates that—

"When Cæsar had spoken such gracious things to the King [Herod], and had put the diadem again upon his head, he proclaimed by decree what he had bestowed upon him, and which he enlarged in the commendation after a magnificent manner."

Herod the Great had a great passion for display in magnificent architecture and monuments, as also had all his ruling descendants after him. As Jerusalem was the metropolis of the Jewish nation, he adorned the city munificently with architectural monuments. To conciliate the Jews, who had been alienated by his continuous aggravations and cruelties as their sovereign, with much address he proposed to reconstruct the ancient temple of Solomon, which had become dilapidated and somewhat moss-covered by the passage of the centuries. But it was shrewdly suspected by the Jews that Herod's real object was to get into his possession the public genealogies of the nations deposited there, especially those relating to the priestly families, unto whom these tables were of paramount interest and importance.

⁸ *Ant.* xiv, 9, 2; comp. Whiston's Note, and Merivale's *Romans Under the Empire*, iii, 87.

⁹ *Ant.* xiv, 13, 1, 2; *Wars*, i, 12, 5.

¹¹ *Hist. Rom.* v, 9.

¹⁰ *Ant.* xiv, 14, 3; *Wars*, i, 14, 4, 2.

¹² *Wars*, i, 20, 3.

§ 316
Herod's
History.

§ 317. Herod's
Architectural
Ambition.

It was believed that he hoped thereby to destroy the genealogy of the expected Messiah, and so destroy the evidence of his kingship, lest he should usurp his kingdom. Be that as it may, he endeavored to create the belief that he was doing his Jewish subjects a great kindness without cost to them; and he promised that he would not build a new temple, but merely restore that built by David's son to its ancient magnificence; for the restoration attempted by Zerubbabel upon the return of Israel from the captivity of Babylon appears to have fallen short in measurement of the ancient architecture, in height some sixty cubits,¹³ and the whole was becoming marked with age and decay. Accordingly, Herod took down the old temple to its foundations, and engaged one thousand wagons to draw stones, and ten thousand skilled workmen to teach the priests the art of stonecutting and carpentering.¹⁴

The temple proper which Herod erected was one hundred cubits in length and twenty cubits in height. It was constructed of white stone, each one being five cubits long and eight high. Surmounting this structure was a great white dome, adorned with pinnacles of gold, suggestive of a mountain of snow as seen from afar. A Jewish tradition affirms that "the temple itself was built by the priests in one year and six months, when they celebrated its completion with Jewish feast and sacrifices; but that the cloisters and outer inclosures were eight years in building." However that may be, it is clear that additions were made continually from year to year; so that, though Herod began the restoration in the year 20 B. C., as a whole it was literally true that the temple was "built in forty and six years,"¹⁵ as the Jews affirmed unto Jesus. But the end was not yet, for the work was continued up to A. D. 64, just six years before the destruction of the temple by the Roman soldiers under Titus. And even when Vespasian made his invasion of Palestine to subdue the Jews in their revolt, Herod's great-grandson, Herod Agrippa II,

¹³ *Ant.* xv, 11, 1.

¹⁴ *Ib.* xv, 11, 2, 3.

¹⁵ *John* ii, 20.

was engaged in expensive preparations to "raise the holy house twenty cubits higher."¹⁶ But the Roman army burned down the temple on the Jewish Sabbath, August 10, A. D. 70.

Near the same time Herod rebuilt the temple of the Samaritans, who also were his subjects, "out of a desire to make the city more eminent than it had been before, but principally because he contrived that it might at once be for his own security and a monument of his magnificence."¹⁷ He is also credited with having erected a monument over the royal tombs at Jerusalem, after having attempted to rob the dead of their treasures, "such as furniture of gold and precious goods that were laid up there."¹⁸

He was not always loyal to the emperor who had appointed him to place and power to rule the Jewish nation. History relates that on one occasion he had made war upon an Arabian prince without having first received the imperial consent. This was a very great offense to Augustus Cæsar, who

§ 318.
Herod's
Character.

"Asked no more than this one question, both of Herod's friends that were there, and of his own friends who were come from Syria; [namely], Whether Herod had led an army thither [into Arabia]? And when they were forced to confess so much, Cæsar, without staying to hear for what reason he did it, and how it was done, grew very angry, and wrote to Herod sharply. The sum of this epistle was this: '*That whereas of old he had used him as his friend, he should now use him as his subject.*'"¹⁹

In race, Herod was an Idumæan; in religion, a Jew; but he was a heathen in practice, and a monster in character. Extremely suspicious and jealous in disposition, he was quick to resent or avenge any supposed wrong with death, when relating to himself or his royalty. Crafty in his schemes, he was arbitrary and despotic in the exercise of his kingly power. But to none of his subjects was he so mercilessly cruel as to the members of his own family and their friends whom his barbarity had so completely alienated in their feelings. Jo-

¹⁶ Wars, v. 1, 5.

¹⁷ Ant. xv, 8, 5.

¹⁸ Ib. xvi, 7, 1.

¹⁹ Ib. xvi, 9, 3.

sephus informs us that Herod had nine wives,²⁰ and on the merest suspicion of treachery he put Mariamne, his favorite and worthiest one, to death;²¹ also her grandfather Hyrcanus;²² also her brother Aristobulus;²³ also his own three sons, Aristobulus, Alexander,²⁴ and Antipater; the last being executed by his order when Herod himself was on his death-bed, just five days before he died.²⁵ And to add to his infamy, he called together the principal men of his kingdom, whom he shut up in the hippodrome at Jericho, where he was ill, with a view to their massacre, giving orders that after his own death they all should be slain, in order that the distress and lamentation which would be national on their account, should seem to the people to be "*the honor of a memorable mourning at his [own] funeral!*"²⁶ But the order was never executed.²⁷ The king had assumed to himself the title "Herod the Great," while it is obvious that he was so great in nothing as in crimes. The characterization of this royal wretch was but just, said to have been given by Augustus Cæsar, knowing the king was a Jew and had slain his third son when on his death-bed: "*It is better to be Herod's hog than to be his son!*"²⁸

In view of the facts narrated by the Jewish historian Josephus, who was a contemporary of the Evangelists, it is very easy to understand and very difficult to disbelieve the truth of the story respecting Herod's procedure toward the infant Jesus at Bethlehem. Apart from the sacred narrative, Josephus leaves no rational ground from which to dispute the distinct statement that Herod did "seek the young Child to destroy him."²⁹ The sufficient motive was realized when the Magi came to Jerusalem and asked of Herod himself: "Where is he that is born King of the Jews?" That inquiry aroused the king's jealousy, so that he and the

§ 319. Herod
and
Christ.

²⁰ Wars, 1, 28, 4; Ant. xvii, 1, 3. ²¹ Ant. xv, 7, 4; Wars, 1, 22, 4, 5.

²² Ant. xv, 6, 2, close. ²³ Id. xv, 3, 3. ²⁴ Id. xvi, 11, 7; Wars, 11, 11, 6, close.

²⁵ Ant. xvii, 7, 1; Wars, 1, 33, 7, 8. ²⁶ Ant. xvii, 6, 5; Wars, 1, 33, 6.

²⁷ Ant. xvii, 8, 2; Wars, 1, 33, 6.

²⁸ "Melius est Herodis porcum esse quam filium," Macrobius, Saturnal, 11, 4.

²⁹ Matt. ii, 13.

city were filled with consternation; for "when Herod the king heard it, he was troubled and all Jerusalem with him."³⁰ A brief review of the facts narrated, will render this conclusion obvious.

Only two Evangelists advert to the circumstances of Christ's nativity, mentioning Herod by name, designating his royalty, and locating his realm. Matthew writes of § 320. King Herod and the Gospel. "Bethlehem of Judæa in the days of Herod the king;"³¹ and Luke cites other interesting facts which occurred "in the days of Herod the king of Judæa."³² The time being thus associated with the birth of Jesus, Herod the king is conclusively identified for all the purposes of history. King Herod being thoroughly aroused respecting the supposed danger of his losing his throne by reason of this recent royal birth, he naturally calls together the chief priests and scribes, and makes careful inquiry of them "*where* Christ should be born."³³ The next step is to engage the Magi as detectives to discover and report to him the Child who was "born king of the Jews," under the pretense that Herod would also come and worship him. He said: "Go and search out carefully concerning the young Child, and when ye have found him, bring me word that I may come and worship him also."³⁴ The purpose of the assassin is adroitly concealed under the pretense of a desire to worship his supposed supplanter! The depth of this treacherous insincerity is revealed and attested by the sequel. The Magi do not return to Herod, and his scheme of secret service fails. Thereupon "Herod was exceeding wroth, and sent forth and slew all the *male children*"³⁵ that were in Bethlehem and all the borders thereof, from two years old and younger, according to the time which he had carefully learned of the wise men." This account of Herod by the Evangelist is not only consistent with itself in its cumulative character, but accordant with the characteristics of Herod as represented by the Jewish historian.

³⁰ Matt. 11, 3.

³¹ *Ib.* 11, 1.

³² Luke 1, 5.

³³ Matt. 11, 4.

³⁴ *Ib.* 11, 8.

³⁵ *Ib.* 11, 16. The gender in Greek is *masculine*: πάντας τοὺς παῖδας.

There is no known reason in the history of the facts narrated by Josephus in his characterization of Herod the Great but compels our belief in Matthew's statement of this circumstance, which is but a mere detail in Herod's life and reign. To reject both without a sufficient reason would be highly irrational, if not absurd.

II. THE SECOND GENERATION OF THE HERODS.

THREE SONS AND SUCCESSORS OF HEROD THE GREAT.

ARCHELAUS—PHILIP II—ANTIPAS.

Objection has been made against the accuracy of the historical New Testament on the ground that the sacred writers designate the Herodian princes by one set of names, but secular historians by others which are assumed to be correct. The synoptists uniformly call the tetrarch of Galilee "Herod," while Josephus and other accredited historians call him "Antipas." It is thence inferred that the Evangelists betray an ignorance of the persons and names of the royal family, and historically erred, and must have written in a later period than is commonly claimed. Now, not only is the case not proved, but, upon the contrary, the criticism is invalidated by the facts. It will be seen that both classes of writers are unqualifiedly correct in designating the house of the Herods just as they have done.

a) It should be carefully noted that the appellation "Herod" was not the personal name of any one prince, but the family name of all the princes; the surname of four generations of the Herodian house mentioned in the Scriptures of the New Testament. Accordingly, written in full, the proper names of the several princes were Herod Archelaus, Herod Antipas, Herod Philip II, Herod Agrippa I, and Herod Agrippa II. Such is the historical fact. Now, so far from proving a discrepancy between the secular and sacred writers, and raising thereupon a presumption against these Scriptures as being un-

historical, the case raises a powerful presumption in their favor. That is, the *usus* being found to be entirely correct, there is the necessary implication that the Evangelists were the contemporaries of the facts which they relate, and were perfectly understood by those addressed of that age without explanations. An historian would be perfectly understood in writing the surname Washington, without any historical reason to prefix the personal name George.

β) But the objection alleged fails fatally when it claims to be founded on fact, that secular writers use one set of names to the exclusion of the other names. The case of Antipas is cited in illustration, whereas it proves the very contrary of that claimed. Josephus, as well as the apostles, was a subject of the Herodian government, and presumably knew critically the names of the rulers of whom, as an historian, he had so much to write. He names this tetrarch both "Herod" and "Antipas" interchangeably; and even takes pains to explain the identity of the person so named. He says: "Now as the ethnarchy of Archelaus was fallen into a Roman province, the other sons of Herod [the Great, viz.], Philip and *that Herod who was called Antipas.*"³⁶ Luke mentions this tetrarch as "Herod," and "Herod the tetrarch," and as "Herod the tetrarch of Galilee" in the same chapter,³⁷ while Josephus repeatedly calls him "Herod the tetrarch,"³⁸ and "Herod the tetrarch of Galilee,"³⁹ and "that Herod who was called Antipas."⁴⁰ The identification, therefore, is perfect as regards the person, the official title, the political geography, and Luke's references and names are proved to be strictly historical.

Herod the Great was especially favored by Augustus with the privilege of bestowing his realm upon his children by will, subject to the approval and confirmation of
 § 322. Herod's Sons and His Kingdom. Cæsar.⁴¹ After Herod's death the three sons mentioned in the will, and others of the royal household, presented themselves before the emperor to have

³⁶ Wars, ii, 9, 1.³⁷ Gospel iii, 1, 19.³⁸ Ant. xviii, 2, 3; Wars, i, 33, 7; ii, 9, 6.³⁹ Ant. xviii, 7, 1, 2.⁴⁰ Wars, ii, 9, 1.⁴¹ Ib. i, 33, 8.

their several appointments ratified by imperial authority. Josephus records:

“So Cæsar, after he heard both sides, dissolved the assembly for the time; but a few days afterward he gave one-half of Herod’s kingdom to Archelaus by the name of *ethnarch* [*i. e.*, ruler of a people in a principality], and promised to make him king afterwards, if he rendered himself worthy of that dignity; but as to the other half, he divided it into two tetrarchies [each equal to one fourth of a province], and gave them to the other two sons of Herod; the one of them to Philip [II] and the other to Antipas.”⁴²

Tacitus made note that

“On the death of Herod a man by the name of Simon, without waiting for the authority of the emperor, seized the sovereignty. He, however, was punished for his ambition by Quintilius Varus, the governor of Syria; and the nation, reduced to submission, was divided in three portions between the sons of Herod.”⁴³

Herod’s kingdom covered all Palestine, including Idumæa, and upon his death was divided among his three sons as indicated. Taken in the order of their ages, Archelaus was made *ethnarch* of one-half of Herod’s kingdom, and included Samaria, Judæa, and Idumæa, which he ruled for ten years, from B. C. 4 to 6 A. D. Herod Philip II was appointed *tetrarch* of one-fourth of the realm located in Northeastern Palestine, and included Batanæa, Trachonitis, and Auranitis [Gaulonitis], and parts of Jamnia.⁴⁴ Herod Antipas became *tetrarch* of Galilee and Peræa,⁴⁵ and included the remaining fourth of the original territory.

There exists a coin struck by Philip II for his principality, which furnishes an incontestable proof, verifying the historical veracity of both Josephus and the Evangelists in styling Herod Philip II “a tetrarch,” and “tetrarch of Ituræa.” It bears the following superscription and legend, namely:

Obverse: “Tiberius Augustus Cæsar;”

Reverse: “Of Philip, Tetrarch;”

with the legend, L A Z, or 37, the year of our Lord’s Crucifixion.⁴⁶

⁴² Wars, II, 6, 3; comp. Ant. xvii, 8, 1; II, 4. ⁴³ Hist. Rom. v, 9.

⁴⁴ Ant. xvii, 1, 3; xvii, 8, 1; II, 4. ⁴⁵ Ib. xvii, 1, 3; xvii, 8, 1; Wars. I, 33, 7.

⁴⁶ Obv: Τιβεριος Σεβαστος Καισαρ. Rev: Φιλίππου τετ[ραρχου].

Another coin is in existence, which was struck by Herod Antipas during his rule in his tetrarchy, dating in the year in which our Lord began his ministry. It reads thus:

Obverse: "Of Herod the tetrarch."

Reverse: "Tiberias, the Capital of the Tetrarchy."

It also bears a palm-branch and the legend "L A T" or [331].⁴⁷

II. SECOND GENERATION OF THE HERODS.

HEROD ARCHELAUS: (B. C. 4-6 A. D.)

This son was the eldest⁴⁸ of the three who succeeded Herod the Great in the rule of the Jews in Palestine. The mother

§ 324. Arche-
laus and his
Ethnarchy.

of Archelaus was Malthaké, a Samaritan woman. With the example of his father constantly before his eyes, it was natural that the character of this prince should be extremely bad, both as a man and as a ruler. When his father's will was to be submitted to the emperor at Rome for confirmation, the other members of the royal family were present and strongly opposed its provision to make Archelaus a king; and Augustus denied him a kingdom, but accompanied the denial with a conditional promise, which was never realized, that he would in the future confer upon him that dignity if he should prove himself worthy of it.⁴⁹ Instead, he made him an ethnarch, and for his realm gave him one-half of his father's territory, embracing Samaria, Judæa, and Idumæa. But Archelaus at once usurped kingly prerogatives against imperial authority. Soon his procedures produced tumults, revolt, and massacre. In less than a decade he had more than justified the urgent protests of the family against his receiving royalty; and even his subjects sent ambassadors to Augustus to expose his cruelties, who charged him with having usurped the prerogatives of a sovereign, "in changing the commanders of the army; in setting up a royal throne before he was made king, and in determining lawsuits, all done as if he were no other than a king;" that

⁴⁷ Obv: Ηρωδου τετραρχου. Rev: Τιβερεας. See Lewin, *Life and Epis. of St. Paul*, i, 17.


⁴⁸ Wars, i, 33, 7. ⁴⁹ Ant. xvii, 11, 4; Wars, ii, 6, 3; 11, 7, 3.

Realms of ARCHELAUS, ANTIPAS, and PHILIP II.

B. C. 4-7. D. 6.

B. C. 4-7. D. 39.

B. C. 4-A. D. 33.



Archelaus had slain three thousand men like "sacrifices . . . till the temple was full of dead bodies; and all this was done, not as an alien, but by one who *pretended* to the lawful title of king."⁵⁰

When in the act of celebrating the Passover feast, Archelaus was put under arrest and hurried off to Rome to answer to the emperor for his cruelties and crimes. The result was, that he was deposed from his government in the tenth year of his ruling, his estates were confiscated, and his person was sent into perpetual banishment at Vienna in Gaul⁵¹ [France], and his territory was reduced to a Roman province. It was attached to Syria, which was under the presidency of Quintilius Varus, and under the special superintendence of Quirinius (Cyrenius) in respect to its financial affairs⁵² as *proprætor*, and under the immediate government of Coponius as *procurator*.⁵³ Quirinius thoroughly adjusted the new relation of Judæa to the empire, and so reconstructed the internal constitution for order that he was called the lawgiver⁵⁴ of the country.

This is the time when Quirinius made his *second* enrollment of Judæa; for it will be remembered that in B. C. 4, he effected the registration of the *population*; and now, in A. D. 6, it was to obtain the registration of the *property*,⁵⁵ as *the new province was tributary to the empire*. As to Coponius, it is the first time that the procurator was imperially invested with absolute power over life and death, which power was then withdrawn from the Jewish Sanhedrin⁵⁶ at Jerusalem. "With Archelaus ended all remaining semblance of the monarchy. The scepter had departed from Judah."⁵⁷ It is understood that Paul was born A. D. 2.⁵⁸

⁵⁰ *Ant.* xvii, 9, 3-5; *Wars*, ii, 7, 3. ⁵¹ *Ant.* xvii, 13, 2; *Wars*, ii, 6, 1, 2; ii, 7, 3.

⁵² *Ant.* xviii, 1, 1; xviii, 2, 1; *Wars*, vii, 8, 1.

⁵³ *Ant.* xviii, 1, 1; xviii, 2, 1, 2; *Wars*, ii, 8, 1.

⁵⁴ *Δικαιοδότης*, *Ant.* xviii, 1, 1.

⁵⁵ *Ant.* xviii, 1, 1; *Wars*, ii, 8, 1; comp. Luke ii, 1, 2, and Acts v, 37.

⁵⁶ *Wars*, ii, 8, 1; John xviii, 31; xix, 10.

⁵⁷ Farrar. ⁵⁸ Lewin.

Upon the reduction of the ethnarchy to a Roman province, Judæa became more intensely Roman than ever before. Roman money circulated freely in the markets of the Jews; Roman words became current in the language of the people; Roman monuments were constructed in honor of the emperor; Roman buildings were erected for the accommodation of the garrisons; cities were adorned and elevated and given Roman names; Betharamptha, already a city, was "called Julias, from the name of the emperor's wife;" the tetrarch Philip advanced Bethsaida to the dignity of a city, and called it Julias, in honor of Cæsar's daughter; and at the fountain of the Jordan he built up Paneas, and named it Cæsarea-Philippi in honor of Cæsar; while Herod Antipas built a city on the west side of the sea and called it Tiberias, in honor of the Emperor Tiberius.⁵⁹

A single reference is made in the New Testament to Herod Archelaus, and it is exceedingly brief and incidental to the narrative given. It is, however, in exact accordance with his character. The allusion relates probably to the close of the first year of Christ's infancy, when Joseph and Mary were returning from Egypt, intending to go to Galilee by way of Jerusalem:

"But when he heard that Archelaus was reigning over Judæa in the room of his father Herod [the Great], he was afraid to go thither; and being warned of God in a dream, he withdrew into the parts of Galilee, and came and dwelt in a city called Nazareth."⁶⁰

a) Objection has been made with reference to this passage, that Matthew fell into error in saying that Archelaus "*was reigning*," an expression which is exact only when applied to a king, and not when applied to an ethnarch. In reply, it is to be said that the *usus* of the term "reign" *at that time* must govern in any such case, and Matthew wrote in strict accordance with the usage of his times. It is not fair criticism to determine accuracy or error of a writer by a modern restric-

⁵⁹ *Ant.* xviii, 2, 1, 2.

⁶⁰ Matthew ii, 22, 23.

tion put upon a word which was wholly unknown in the usage of the ancients. The exclusive application of the term "reign" to royalty is modern, and without force in the case in hand.*

β) But the criticism is fallacious in that Matthew is not making an original statement of his own on his own responsibility, but he has *merely placed on record what the report was which Joseph heard*: "But when he heard that Archelaus was reigning over Judæa in the room of his father Herod," etc. To record aright the rumor which Joseph "heard" is Matthew's part, and there his responsibility ends. Moreover, the report was probably based upon the fact that Herod the Great had provided in his will that Archelaus should be made king of Judæa and Peræa, and upon the opening of the will at Jericho, the soldiers and people made acclamation and congratulation that he was to be advanced to royalty. But Cæsar did not approve this provision.⁶¹

HEROD PHILIP II (B. C. 4-34 A. D.)

This prince, the second ruling prince in age, was the son of Herod the Great and Cleopatra.⁶² He must be carefully distinguished from his half-brother Philip I, the son of Herod the Great and Mariamne, Herod's favorite wife, whom he slew. By his will, Mariamne's son, Philip, was excluded from having any share in the government, on his mother's account.⁶³ He married Herodias, and they had one child named Salome. Herodias afterwards eloped with Herod Antipas. Salome seems to have accompanied her mother, and, at the instigation of the mother, demanded the head of John the Baptist. Cleopatra's son, Philip II, married Salome, who was his niece.⁶⁴ He was the tetrarch of Ituræa, whose subjects were mostly Syrians and Greeks, but very loyal to the tetrarch. In secular history, Philip II is represented as a peaceful and successful ruler of

§ 326. Philip II
the
Tetrarch.

* See this principle discussed fully under *Herod Antipas*.

⁶¹ Wars, i, 33, 8, 9; Ant. xvii, 8, 1, 2; xvii, 6, 1.

⁶² Ant. xvii, 1, 3; xviii, 5, 4; Wars, i, 28, 4. ⁶³ Wars, i, 30, 7. ⁶⁴ Ant. xviii, 5, 4.

his tetrarchy for a period of thirty-seven years, and was "a person of moderation and quietness in the conduct of his life and government," who had such consideration for his people that whither he went in travel he was accompanied by his tribunal, ready at any time to stop and ascend the seat of justice to adjudicate cases for cause. He died in A. D. 34, in the twentieth year of the reign of Tiberius. He was much beloved, and "when he was carried to his monument, which he had already erected for himself beforehand, he was buried with great pomp."⁶⁵ He left no child to succeed him in the government, and his territory was annexed to the province of Syria. Philip II had the distinction of being the first *Jewish prince* who had images struck on his coins⁶⁶—a circumstance which was remarkable in that the Jews regarded themselves prohibited by the commandment from making images of any kind in art.

§ 327. The Tetrarch in the Gospels. Four persons named Philip are mentioned in the historical New Testament. These are—

- a) Philip the disciple and apostle of Christ;⁶⁷
- β) Philip the deacon and evangelist;⁶⁸
- γ) Philip I, son of Mariamne, who married Herodias;⁶⁹
- δ) Philip II, son of Cleopatra, the "tetrarch of Ituræa."⁷⁰

Reference is made also to the city built by this tetrarch in honor of the emperor, at the base of Mount Hermon, called Cæsarea-Philippi, which, in sacred geography, is to be distinguished from Cæsarea-on-the-Sea. It was at or near this city, in the northern extreme of Palestine, that Jesus engaged his disciples in the memorable conversation respecting the opinions entertained of himself, when he asked:

"Whom do men say that the Son of man is? . . . But whom say ye that I am? And Simon Peter answered and said: Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God. And Jesus answered and said unto him: Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-Jonah; for flesh and blood hath not

⁶⁵ *Ant.* xviii, 4, 6.

⁶⁶ Madden, *Jewish Coins*; Lewin, *Life and Epis. of St. Paul*, i, 17.

⁶⁷ *Matt.* x, 3; *Acts* i, 13.

⁶⁸ *Acts* vi, 5; viii, 26-40; xxi, 8.

⁶⁹ *Mark* vi, 17.

⁷⁰ *Luke* iii, 1.

revealed it unto thee, but my Father who is in heaven." "And he began to teach them that the Son of man must suffer many things, and be rejected by the elders and chief priests, and be killed, and after three days rise again."⁷¹

No other references are made in the New Testament to Herod Philip II, "tetrarch of Ituræa."

HEROD ANTIPAS (B. C. 4-39 A. D.)

This prince was the youngest son of Herod the Great and Malthaké.⁷² Josephus says that the mother of Herod Antipas "was of the Samaritan nation, whose sons were Antipas and Archelaus;"⁷³ that on his death-bed the father "altered his testament, . . . for he appointed Antipas, to whom before he had left the kingdom, to be tetrarch of Galilee and Peræa."⁷⁴ "And he made Antipas tetrarch."⁷⁵

As a ruler he was regarded as "sly, ambitious, luxurious, but not so able as his father."⁷⁶ Hausrath does him the scant courtesy of calling him "a wily sneak." Of Antipas, Jesus said: "Go tell that fox, Behold I cast out devils."⁷⁷ His administration was characterized by cunning and crime, for he was intensely selfish and utterly destitute of principle. In the year 37 the Emperor Tiberius died, and he was immediately succeeded by Caius Caligula. This emperor soon discovered the real character of Herod Antipas. Moreover, that he was disloyal to the imperial throne was evidenced by the discovery that Antipas had been intriguing with one Sejanus, a Roman officer of the army, and had confederated with Artabanus, King of Parthia, against the Roman Empire, and had laid in store armor for seventy thousand men of war. Upon the proof of this procedure by his own nephew, Herod Agrippa I, who was the devoted friend of the emperor, Caius Caligula, in the year 39, "took away his tetrarchy and gave it to Herod

⁷¹ Matt. xvi, 13-17; Mark viii, 27-31.

⁷² Wars, i, 28, 4; Ant. xvii, 6, 1.

⁷⁵ Wars, i, 33, 7.

⁷³ Ant. xvii, 1, 3.

⁷⁶ Schürer.

⁷⁴ Ib. xvii, 8, 1.

⁷⁷ Luke xiii, 32.

Agrippa," who had exposed the intrigue, and Antipas was sent into perpetual banishment in France and Spain, where he died. On this point Josephus says:

"So he [*i. e.*, Caligula] took from him his tetrarchy, and gave it by way of addition to Agrippa's kingdom; he also gave Herod Antipas's money to Agrippa, and by way of punishment awarded him a perpetual banishment, and appointed Lyons, a city in Gaul, as the place of his habitation." "So Herod died in Spain."⁷⁸ Dion Cassius adds: "Herod the Palestinean, having given a certain occasion by reason of his brothers, was banished beyond the Alps, and his portion [estates] of the government confiscated to the State."⁷⁹

What brought to pass this state of affairs was this. Antipas had been for a long time urged by his wife Herodias to go to Rome and request the emperor to bestow upon him the kingly crown. He was extremely envious of his nephew, Agrippa I, who had suddenly risen, from being in prison under Tiberius, to receiving a kingdom under Caligula. Antipas had deeply offended Agrippa by insulting reflections on his former condition, before royalty had been bestowed upon him. Meantime Agrippa maintained a confidential intimacy with the emperor, and kept him posted regarding these movements and projects of Antipas. When, then, Antipas started for Rome in quest of his own interests, accompanied by his wife, Agrippa instantly sent his freedman, named Fortunatus, to Rome also, bearing the necessary documents in proof of the accusations to be made against Antipas; and Agrippa followed in a few days further to confront his uncle in the presence of the emperor. Antipas had arrived, and was having his first interview with Caligula, when Fortunatus entered into the presence of the emperor and placed in his hands the letters in his possession. Agrippa arriving very soon, and all the accusations being now well understood by all parties, he challenged Antipas to deny the confederating with Sejanus and with Artabanus, and his secret storing of arms in perfidy against

⁷⁸*Ant.* xviii, 7, 1, 2; *Wars*, 11, 9, 6.

⁷⁹*Hist. of Rome*, B. iv, Aug. 27.

the imperial government. As Antipas could not deny the accusations, he confessed his guilt.⁸⁰

Turning to the Scriptures, Herod Antipas is frequently referred to in the first two Gospels as being "*a king*;" whereas Josephus distinctly states that kingship was the thing denied him, and that he was "made tetrarch" in his government. Criticism accordingly claims that this discrepancy in the writers is evidence that the Evangelists erred. Matthew designates Antipas both as tetrarch and king in the same chapter. Mark invariably calls him a king, and frequently in the same chapter. Upon the other hand, Luke invariably designates him as a tetrarch.

§ 329. Antipas
as
a King.

Matthew says: "Herod the tetrarch heard the report concerning Jesus." . . . And again: "The king was grieved."⁸¹ Mark says: "The king heard thereof;" "and the king said unto the damsel;" "and she came straightway with haste unto the king;" and "the king was exceeding sorry;" and "the king sent a soldier of the guard,"⁸² etc. Luke, however, says: "Herod being tetrarch of Galilee;" "Herod the tetrarch being reproved by him;" "Now Herod the tetrarch heard of all that was done;" and "Manaen, the foster-brother of Herod the tetrarch."⁸³

Now, it is obvious that this frequency of the title "king" was not a matter of inadvertance, but of design, in the sacred writers, and there must be some good reason for its use. The case demands an explanation. Even some eminent scholars seem to have felt embarrassed, prior to investigation, perhaps.* At any rate the only justifying reason for the Evangelists' usage in employing the terms "king" and "tetrarch" interchangeably, *is the etymological reason*. As in the case of Archelaus "*reigning*" in his father's stead, so here in the case of Herod Antipas and the cognate appellation "king." We have only to difference the modern idea and *usus* from the

*Alford says: "Herod was not king properly, but only tetrarch." Westcott says: "He was called king by courtesy." Farrar says: "It is only popularly that he is called king." Whedon says that he was called king "in compliance with custom."

⁸⁰ *Ant.* xviii, 7, 1, 2.

⁸¹ *Matt.* xiv, 1, 9.

⁸² *Mark* vi, 14, 22-27.

⁸³ *Luke* iii, 1, *τετραρχέω*; *τετράρχης*, iii, 19; ix, 7; *Acts* xiii, 1.

ancient to have the sufficient explanation. For we *now* apply this appellative *exclusively* to royalty, whereas at that period it applied not only to a sovereign, but “in a general and lower sense it applied equally to a *prince, ruler, viceroy, and the like;*”⁸⁴ “to a king’s son, a prince, or any one sharing in the government, . . . and, after Augustus, to any great man.”⁸⁵ Josephus himself, indeed, who so constantly designates Herod Antipas as having been made “tetrarch” by his father’s will, employs this usage when he says that his father “sent also for his testament and altered it, *and therein made Antipas king.*”⁸⁶ The ancient *usus* in distinction from the modern being considered, the difficulty at once disappears.

Herod Antipas was twice married; first to the daughter of Aretas, an Arabian king of Petræa. Nevertheless, he intrigued with Herodias, who was then the wife of Herod Philip I, the son of Mariamne, in whose house Antipas was a guest.⁸⁷ Antipas and Herodias eloped together, although both were married at the time. Herodias was a granddaughter of Herod the Great, and sister of Herod Agrippa I. Now the scandalous conduct of Antipas and Herodias is pointedly referred to in the three Synoptic Gospels which cite the reproof administered by John the Baptist to the tetrarch Herod Antipas. “For John said, It is not lawful for thee to have thy brother’s wife;” and Luke adds: “Herod [Antipas] the tetrarch being reproved by him for Herodias, Philip’s wife, and for all the evils which he had done, added yet this above all, that he shut up John in prison.”^{88*}

From the time that Herod Antipas had slain the Baptist, this crime haunted his conscience. When, then, he heard of the miracles done by Jesus, “he was perplexed, because it was

* See chap. iv, §§ 69-76, and *Herodias* in this chapter, §§ 343-345.

⁸⁴ Robinson’s *Greek Dict. of N. T.*, Βασιλεύς and βασιλεύω.

⁸⁵ Liddell and Scott, *Gr. Dict.*, 1888, Βασιλεύω. ⁸⁶ *Wars*, i, 32, 7, and i, 33, 8.

⁸⁷ *Ant.* xviii, 5, 1; xviii, 5, 4.

⁸⁸ *Matt.* xiv, 3; *Mark* vi, 18; *Luke* iii, 19.

said of some that John had risen from the dead." "And Herod [Antipas] said: John have I beheaded, but who is this of whom I hear such things?" "This is John the Baptist; he is risen from the dead, and therefore mighty works do show forth themselves in him."⁸⁹ Jesus said of Antipas: "Go ye and tell that fox, Behold I cast out devils, and I do cures to-day and to-morrow, and the third day I shall be perfected."⁹⁰

§331. Jesus
and
Antipas.

During the trial of Christ before Pilate, Herod Antipas was at Jerusalem. When Pilate came to understand that Jesus was from Galilee, the territory and realm of Antipas, "he sent him to Herod" as belonging to his jurisdiction. "And when Herod saw him, he was exceedingly glad; for he was desirous to see him of a long season, because he had heard many things of him, and hoped to see some miracle done by him." But when Christ declined to answer any questions of curiosity for Herod's gratification, the tetrarch was offended, and "Herod with his men of war set him at naught, and mocked him, and arrayed him in a gorgeous robe, and sent him again to Pilate. And the same day Pilate and Herod were made friends together; for before, they were at enmity between themselves."⁹¹ This is the last glimpse we have of Herod Antipas in the historical New Testament. When he was deposed and banished, as already cited, the second generation of the rulers of the house of the Herods passed out of history.

III. THE THIRD GENERATION OF THE HERODS.

HEROD AGRIPPA I (A. D. 37-44).

Prince Agrippa was the son of Aristobulus and Bernice, and grandson of Herod the Great. He was born B. C. 10, and died A. D. 44. He was the child of two first-cousins, and he was himself married to his own cousin, the daughter of an aunt, who again married an uncle.⁹² Josephus calls him "Agrippa" and "Agrippa

§332. His
Life as
a Prince.

⁸⁹ Matt. xiv, 2, 10; Luke ix, 7, 9.

⁹⁰ Luke xiii, 32.

⁹¹ Luke xxiii, 6-12; comp. Acts iv, 27.

⁹² Wars, i, 28, 1.

the Great;”⁹³ but in the New Testament he is known only by the surname “Herod,” or “Herod the king.” He was educated at Rome, as were most of the Herodian princes. He grew up to be a young man of gracious manners, of kindly spirit usually, with great powers of eloquence, and quite vain withal. In religion, Agrippa was a zealous rather than a devout Jew,⁹⁴ attentive to the “tithe of mint, and anise, and cummin,” but neglectful of “the weightier matters of the law—judgment, mercy, and truth.” He seems to have had much personal magnetism, and was keenly alive to popularity.⁹⁵ At Rome, Agrippa formed a warm friendship with Prince Caius (Gaius) Caligula who was heir-apparent to the imperial throne; a friendship which subsequently turned greatly to the advantage of Agrippa.

A surprise of fortune arose out of this intimacy. As these two friends were riding out together in a chariot one day, Eutyclus, a freedman, was charioteer. In the course of confidential conversation, Agrippa dramatically stretched out his hands and said to Caligula that he wished that old Tiberius would die, that Caligula might assume the purple and the crown. The freedman, overhearing the remark, reported it to his master, the Emperor Tiberius, who at once ordered Agrippa put in chains and incarcerated in prison. The order was executed, Agrippa still wearing his princely robe among the criminals of the State. This humiliation was endured by Agrippa about six months, when Tiberius died, and Caligula immediately succeeded him as emperor. Soon after the imperial funeral, Agrippa was summoned to appear at the imperial palace of Caligula. Having shaved and changed his robe, he presented himself before the emperor, his friend, who at once

“Proceeded to put a diadem upon Agrippa’s head, and appointed him to be a king of the tetrarchy of [his uncle] Philip;” “also . . . changed his iron chain for a gold one of equal weight,” which he hung

⁹³ *Ant.* xvii, 2, 2; xviii, 5, 4.

⁹⁴ *Ib.* xix, 6, 1, 2; xix, 7, 3.

⁹⁵ *Acts* xii, 1-3.

about Agrippa's neck. And Agrippa afterwards "hung it up within the limits of the temple at the treasury [at Jerusalem] that it might be a memorial of the severe fate he had lain under, . . . a demonstration how the greatest prosperity may have a fall, and that God sometimes raises what is fallen down; . . . for this chain thus dedicated, afforded a document to all men that King Agrippa had once been bound in a chain for a small cause, but recovered his former dignity, and was advanced to be a more illustrious king."⁹⁶ The Senate also gave him the honorary position of prætor.

In the second year of Caligula's reign, Agrippa requested leave of the emperor to return home to Palestine and take possession of his kingdom. Permission was granted, and Agrippa sailed on the Mediterranean in the usual course by way of Alexandria in Egypt. At this time the Jews and Greeks of the city were in unpleasant relations with each other. When the Greeks saw this new Jewish king, accompanied by his body-guard, exploiting much gold and silver, they mocked his royalty with meanest insults. They engaged a naked idiot boy, named Carabas, who was the butt of the street boys, placed on his head a crown of paper, clothed him in mat-cloth, and, with a stick in his hand to represent a scepter, and with a body-guard composed of the *gamins* of the city, they derided the new king on the stage. Not so, however, at his home; for when Agrippa reached his own subjects in Palestine, the Jews were astonished to see him returning with all the honors of royalty, and received him with every evidence of satisfaction.

In accordance with his promise in taking leave of the emperor at the Capital, Agrippa, having organized and established his kingdom, returned to the imperial city. It was about the time that Caligula developed unmistakable signs of incipient insanity, demanding that he should be universally deified throughout the empire and be adored as a god, and that all men should swear by his name. He filled his Jewish subjects with consternation and horror when he ordered Petronius from Syria to place a gilded

§ 334. Agrippa
and
Royalty.

§ 335. Returns
to
Rome.

⁹⁶ *Ant.* xviii, 6, 10, 11; xix, 6, 1.

statue of the emperor in the Holy of Holies in the temple at Jerusalem, to be worshiped; for when they submitted to become subjects of the empire, they were guaranteed all their national and religious liberty and rights. An embassy composed of the principal men of Alexandria, with the eminent Philo at their head, went to Rome to protest and persuade Caligula to desist from such an inexpressible wrong. Caligula, refused them his presence, and bade Philo "begone."* Petronius marched an army to Jerusalem to compel submission. At Ptolemais, the Jews flocked by the ten thousand to petition the Syrian prefect not "to violate the laws of their forefathers;" but, if he persisted in carrying out the imperial order, he should first kill them, and then do what he was resolved upon doing. Petronius, touched with their loyalty to their religious convictions, promised to write to the emperor in their behalf.⁹⁷

Meantime Agrippa had reached Rome, and furnished, in honor of his friend Caligula, a magnificent banquet; and when the emperor was full of wine, and Agrippa had drunk to his health, Caligula, under a generous impulse, proposed in return,—

"All that I have bestowed upon thee that may be called *my gifts, is but little*. Everything that may contribute to thy happiness shall be at thy service, and that cheerfully, and so far as my ability will reach"— "thinking that he would ask for some large country, or revenues of certain cities." "Agrippa replied: Since thou, O my Lord, declarest such is thy readiness to grant that I am worthy of thy gifts, I will ask nothing relating to my own felicity, . . . but I desire somewhat which may make thee glorious for piety, . . . and may be for an honor to me among those that inquire about it, . . . that thou wilt no longer think of the dedication of that statue which thou hast ordered to be set up in the Jewish temple by Petronius."⁹⁸

This appeal was successful. Nevertheless, Petronius, for having so far disobeyed the imperial command as to intercede against the order given him, which he failed to obey, was now ordered to commit suicide; but the order was delayed at Rome

* *Flaccum*, §§ 5, 8.

⁹⁷ *Ant.* xviii, 8, 1-6.

⁹⁸ *Ib.* xviii, 8, 1-9.

for a short time, and in the meantime Caligula died by the dagger of an assassin, a tribune named Chærea, whom the emperor had outrageously insulted. This was in A. D. 41.

The weak-minded Claudius, who had been the laughing-stock of the Roman court, now came to the front for the succession. Through the friendly offices of Herod Agrippa I, who, with adroit diplomacy, used his influence with the Senate, this man was made emperor. His pre-eminent services were recognized "as ambassador to the Senate," and to the soldiers. As his return for his elevation to the imperial succession in the house of the Cæsars and the empire of the world, Josephus again states that—

§336. Agrippa
and his
Kingdom.

"Claudius confirmed the kingdom of Agrippa which Caius [Caligula] had given him, and therein commended the king highly. He also made an addition to it of all that country over which Herod [the Great], who, was his grandfather, had reigned; that is, Judæa and Samaria." "Moreover, he bestowed on Agrippa his whole paternal kingdom immediately, and, besides, added to it those countries that had been given by Augustus to Herod [Philip II]; namely, Trachonitis and Auranitis, and still, besides these, the kingdom which was called the kingdom of Lysanias. This gift he declared to the people by a decree, but ordered the magistrates to have the donation engraven on tables of brass, and to be set up in the Capital."⁹⁹

Such in brief is the story of the attainment of the crown and kingdom of his grandfather, Herod the Great, by Herod Agrippa I. But he was made to feel that, after all, his dominion was but a dependency upon the empire which dominated the nations which it included. Being of Idumæan origin, it is related that on one occasion, at the Feast of the Tabernacles, the lesson of the Law for the day was read: "Thou shalt in any wise set him king over thee whom the Lord thy God shalt choose. . . . Thou mayest not set a stranger over thee which is not thy brother." Remembering that he was of foreign stock, and so recognized by his brethren, though the Idumæans had been Jews for more than a hundred years,

⁹⁹ *Ant.* xix, 5, 1; *Wars*, ii, 11, 5

he burst into tears before them all; and the people sympathizingly said: "Fear not, Agrippa, thou art our brother." For the Law also required: "Thou shalt not abhor the Edomite, for he is thy brother. . . . The children that are begotten of them shall enter into the congregation of the Lord, in their third generation." Agrippa's case met these conditions, and he was therefore entitled to the proposed consideration.¹⁰⁰

Agrippa I made his residence mostly at Jerusalem, and commenced building impregnable walls to fortify the city. But Marsus Vibius, now prefect of Syria, ordered its discontinuance on the mere ground of his suspicion. The king, like all the Herods, was fond of ostentatious displays.¹⁰¹ He had once invited a number of friends, who were petty kings contiguous to his own realm, to be his guests and enjoy his hospitality at the city of Tiberias, where royal spectacles were to be witnessed. Vibius came also from Syria. Agrippa and the five kings thought to do him honor, and went forth in a chariot about seven furlongs to meet the prefect. But Vibius, being again suspicious of the real intent of this gathering, made an affront to every one assembled, by peremptorily ordering the five kings to proceed at once and quietly to their respective homes.¹⁰²

There is *numismatic* evidence in existence of this sovereign's reign, which completes the historicity of his kingdom. It consists of a coin struck at Cæsarea by Herod Agrippa, which reads:

Obverse: Agrippa the Great, Lover of Cæsar.

Reverse: Cæsar-on-Port-Sebastos.*

There are two points of contact between the Evangelist Luke and the historian Josephus in their narratives, and two points of unpremeditated coincidence. These relate to the

* Obv.: ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥΣ ΜΕΓΑΣ ΑΓΡΙΠΠΑ ΦΙΛΟΚΑΙΣΕΡ. Rev.: ΚΑΙΣΕΡ Η ΣΕΒΑΣΤΩ ΛΙΜΕΝΙ. Σεβαστος (Sebastos) was the standing Greek word for Augustus, a title assumed by several emperors; e. g., Acts xxv, 21, 25. "Cumanus took one troop of horsemen, called the troop of Sebaste, out of Cæsarea." (Wars, ii, 12, 5.)

¹⁰⁰ Deut. xvii, 15; xxiii, 7, 8.

¹⁰¹ Ant. xix, 7, 2, 5.

¹⁰² Ib. xix, 8, 1.

kingship and the death of Herod Agrippa I. Luke's statement is to the effect that "Herod the King" afflicted the Church, beheaded James, brother of John, and imprisoned Peter, "because he saw it pleased the Jews." The record of the story is:

§ 337. Agrippa I
and
St. Luke.

"Now about this time Herod the king put forth his hands to afflict certain of the Church. And he killed James the brother of John with the sword. And when he saw that it pleased the Jews, he proceeded to seize Peter also, . . . intending after the Passover to bring him forth to the people, . . . but prayer was made earnestly of the Church for him."¹⁰³

Now, the beheading of James is accordant with the Talmud in the Mishna: "The ordinance of putting to death by the sword is as follows: The man's head is cut off with a sword, as is accustomed to be done *by royal command*."¹⁰⁴ The giving to Herod Agrippa I the title of king, with the implication of royalty, is absolutely and historically correct; but it would be correct only for the brief period of three years; namely, A. D. 41-44. There never had been a king ruling in royalty over Judæa during the forty years previously, and never since those three years; and these years were the last of the life of Herod Agrippa I, called also "Agrippa the Great,"¹⁰⁵ the grandson of Herod the Great, who was king of all the land of Palestine from 37 to 4 B. C.

Agrippa, his deputies, and other dignitaries of his kingdom, were assembled at Cæsarea, at the seaside, to celebrate the games at a festival, and to offer vows for the safety and prosperity of the Emperor Claudius. Early in the morning of the second day of the celebration, King Agrippa presented himself to the people clad "in a garment made wholly of silver and of a texture truly wonderful." Josephus says that when the sun's rays touched his dress, the reflections shone out with amazing splendor. The people shouted "that he was a god," and "the king did

§ 338. The
Death of
Agrippa I.

¹⁰³ Acts xii. ¹⁰⁴ Professor Lumby's note, *in loco*. ¹⁰⁵ *Ant.* xvii, 2, 2; xviii, 5, 4.

neither rebuke them nor reject their impious flattery." After five days "he departed this life, being in the fifty-fourth year of his age."¹⁰⁶ Luke, upon the other hand, says of King Agrippa:

"He went down from Judæa to Cæsarea, and tarried there. . . . And upon a set day Herod arrayed himself in royal apparel and sat on the throne, and made an oration unto them; and the people shouted saying, The voice of a god, and not of a man. And immediately an angel of the Lord smote him, because he gave not God the glory; and he was eaten of worms, and gave up the ghost."¹⁰⁷

The points of accordance between these two independent writers is something remarkable. They agree in many particulars, and conflict in none; and what one in brevity omits, the other supplies in matters of detail. Josephus was writing an historical account of Herod Agrippa I, but Luke was writing an account of the persecution of the Church, and incidentally refers to Agrippa's death. Accordingly, Luke's reference is the briefer, yet sufficiently full to be germane to the end had in view. An analysis of the two writings yields some interesting parallels of mutual confirmation. Both authors mention that Agrippa went to Cæsarea, where he spent some time. Josephus relates that it was a festival occasion, when games were exhibited in honor of Cæsar, which circumstances Luke naturally omits; Luke, on the other hand, relates that "Agrippa sat on his throne and made an oration unto them," circumstances which Josephus omits to mention. Luke indicates that in the public occasion there was "a set day" when Agrippa appeared before the people; Josephus says that it was on the "second day when he appeared in the theater" to the multitude. Luke makes mention of a large assembly of "the people," whom Agrippa addressed; Josephus explains that there was a gathering of "the principal persons of dignity throughout the province." Luke says that "Herod arrayed himself in royal apparel;" while Josephus describes his robes as "made wholly of silver and of a contexture truly wonder-

¹⁰⁶ *Ib.* xix, 8, 2.

¹⁰⁷ Acts xii, 9, 21-23.

Chalcis o



ful." Luke says that the effect of this surprising spectacle was such that the "people shouted;" Josephus says that the king's appearance was "so resplendent as to spread a horror [awe] over those" that beheld it. Luke says that they cried out, "The voice of a god, and not of a man;" Josephus says that they cried out, one in one place and another from another, "He is a god." Luke implies that the king accepted their homage "because he gave not God the glory;" Josephus says that "he did not rebuke them, nor reject their impious flattery." Luke says that he was smitten of an angel "and gave up the ghost;" Josephus says that "after five days he departed this life." Josephus, in general terms as an historian, says that Agrippa died from "a pain in his belly;" but Luke, as a careful physician, says that "he was eaten of worms." What two witnesses in any court giving independent testimony would agree more perfectly in the recital of facts? And what is most remarkable in these descriptions is not the points of difference, but the points of agreement between them. Josephus the historian therefore, again and in an extraordinary manner, confirms the historicity of the Evangelist Luke.

IV. FOURTH GENERATION OF THE HERODS.

HEROD AGRIPPA II (52-70 A. D.)

Considerable difficulty has been experienced in distinguishing the father and son, as they bear exactly the same name, and both were Jewish kings. Attention, therefore, is drawn to the fact that, in both sacred ^{§339. The Two} and secular history, these two personages are ^{Agrippas} distinguished. ^{Distinguished.} Outside the Scripture the elder is called Herod Agrippa I, and the younger, Herod Agrippa II. But in the New Testament the father is named either "Herod," as he is repeatedly called in a single chapter, or "Herod the king;"¹⁰⁸ whereas the son, in contradistinction

¹⁰⁸ Acts xii, 1, 6, 11, 19-21.

from his father, is called either "Agrippa," or "King Agrippa."¹⁰⁹ Both were kings, and were known by the same name; but they did not reign at the same time, or rule the same realm. Herod Agrippa I, as was Herod the Great his grandfather, was king of all Palestine during A. D. 41-44, and, later, Herod Agrippa II was king of about one-third of that country lying in the northeast, embracing that region formerly known as the tetrarchies of Philip and Lysanias, which he ruled A. D. 52-70. As to Scriptural incidents associated with each, it was Herod Agrippa I who beheaded James, the brother of John, and imprisoned Peter whom the angel delivered by night;¹¹⁰ but it was Herod Agrippa II who was present to hear the masterly and courtly address of Paul at Cæsarea, whom the apostle mentions as "king" and "King Agrippa," as does also Luke when narrating the same occasion.¹¹¹ Herod Agrippa I died at Cæsarea in A. D. 44, after delivering an oration in the theater; and Herod Agrippa II died at Rome in private life, in A. D. 100, in the third year of Trajan's reign.

The great grandson of Herod the Great, and son of Herod Agrippa I, was but seventeen years of age when the father died.¹¹² He was born in A. D. 27, and at the death of his father was residing at Rome, receiving his education under the patronage of the emperor. "Now Agrippa the son of the deceased was at Rome, and brought up with Claudius Cæsar." This emperor at first contemplated placing young Agrippa at once upon his father's throne to rule all Palestine; but, better counsels prevailing, he concluded that it would be "a dangerous experiment for so very young a man," who was without experience, to undertake to govern "so large a kingdom." "So Claudius made the country a Roman province, and sent Cuspius Fadus to be procurator of Judæa and of the entire kingdom."¹¹³

§ 340. The
Youth of
Agrippa II.

¹⁰⁹ Acts xxv, 22, 23, 26; xxvi, 27, 28, 32.

¹¹⁰ Acts xii, 1-3.

¹¹¹ *Ib.* xxvi, 1, 2, 7, 19, 27; xxv, 13, 22-24, 26; xxvi, 28, 32.

¹¹² *Ant.* xix, 9, 1.

¹¹³ *Ib.* xix, 9, 2; *Wars*, ii, 12, 1.

When his uncle Herod, King of Chalcis, died in A. D. 48, young Agrippa had attained the twenty-first year of his age. Thereupon "Claudius set Agrippa, the son of Agrippa, over his uncle's kingdom." "But he took from him Chalcis when he had governed thereof four years," and "removed Agrippa [II] from Chalcis to a greater kingdom," embracing the former tetrarchies of Philip and Lysanias, with considerable additions.¹¹⁴ All the remainder of his father's kingdom continued as a Roman province until the destruction of the Jewish nation in A. D. 70. Herod Agrippa II was now made superintendent of the temple at Jerusalem, and manager of its treasury, with full power to remove the high priests from office at pleasure, an authority which he was often pleased to exercise, as also did his uncle Herod of Chalcis before him.¹¹⁵ When Nero's accession to the throne of the empire had been effected, he made an imperial gift to his dominions of several cities and fourteen villages.¹¹⁶ Agrippa II thereupon had a coin struck in honor of Nero bearing the following representation:

§ 341. Agrippa
II and
Royalty.

Obverse: Nero Cæsar; with the head of Nero laureated.

Reverse: By King Agrippa, Neronias; within an olive crown.*

That is, Cæsarea Philippi being the capital of his kingdom, Herod Agrippa II re-named the city Neronias in honor of Nero. Josephus says: "About this time it was that King Agrippa built Cæsarea Philippi larger than before, and in honor of Nero named it Neronias."¹¹⁷ But the subjects of the younger Agrippa regarded him as a cold-blooded and arbitrary man, and did not entertain for him the love which they had

* Obv.: ΝΕΡΩΝ ΚΑΙ. Rev.: ΕΠΙ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΑ. ΑΓΡΙΠΠΗ, ΝΕΡΩΝΙΕ.

In June, 1891, there was discovered in Si'a, Hauran, near Damascus, a monumental inscription in Greek, in honor of Agrippa II, which reads: ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥΣ ΜΕΓΑΣ ΦΙΛΟΚΑΙΣΑΡ ΕΤΣΕΒΗΣ ΚΑΙ ΦΙΛΟΡΩΜΑΙΟΣ = "Great King, Lover-of-Cæsar, devout, Lover-of-Rome." (See George Adam Smith's *Historical Geography of the Holy Land*.)

¹¹⁴ *Ant.* xx, 7, 1; *Wars*, ii, 12, 8.

¹¹⁶ *Ib.* xx, 8, 4.

¹¹⁵ *Ant.* xx, 1, 3; xx, 8, 8.

¹¹⁷ *Ib.* xx, 9, 4.

for his father;¹¹⁸ yet he was recognized as well skilled in all matters relating to the Jewish law.¹¹⁹

It is now in place to indicate the points of concurrence between sacred and secular history touching the times and person of Herod Agrippa II, the last of the rulers in the house of the Herods. It is mentioned in § 342. Agrippa II and the Scriptures. the Acts of the Apostles that there was a special occasion and assembly at Cæsarea-by-the-Sea. Upon the arrival of Festus from Rome at Cæsarea, the capital of provincial Judæa, to assume the functions of his office as procurator, Agrippa came hither to extend his royal salutations and congratulations to Festus, and witness his advancement to place and power in the Roman government.¹²⁰ The occasion was celebrated with much circumstance of pomp and display, of both a civic and military character. That, however, which seems to have centralized all interests, was a man of great distinction who was a prisoner in chains on Festus's hands, concerning the proper disposition of whom the new procurator desired the counsel of King Agrippa II. The king himself had no authority in Cæsarea. His mission was one of courtesy, and his participation in the occasion was merely advisory. He had heard much respecting the distinguished prisoner now in chains, and was curious to see and hear his eloquent utterances. Accordingly the Apostle Paul was brought forth at Cæsarea before the brilliant assembly of the dignitaries of the province, and Herod Agrippa II and his sister, the princess Bernice, and invited by the king to make a defense of his Christian faith. Luke says: "Now when certain days were passed, Agrippa the king and Bernice arrived at Cæsarea, and saluted Festus."¹²¹

This visit in company with Bernice has been called in question on the score of its historicity as being very unusual; but it finds corroboration in that it was the custom of Agrippa to make visits of courtesy and ceremony on other such occasions. For in the year 64 he went to Beirut to salute Gessius Florus,

¹¹⁸ *Ant.* xx, 8, 11; xx, 9, 4.

¹²⁰ Acts xxv, 13.

¹¹⁹ Acts xxvi, 3.

¹²¹ *Ib.* xxv, 13, and xxvi.

when he assumed the procuratorship of Judæa; and again in 66, when Tiberius Alexander became prefect of Alexandria. With regard to both these occasions, Josephus says he went "to Berytus with the intention of meeting Gessius, the Roman governor of Judæa."¹²² Also, "about this time King Agrippa [the II] was going to Alexandria to congratulate Alexander upon his having obtained the government of Egypt from Nero."¹²³ In both instances King Agrippa was accompanied by his sister Bernice.

King Herod Agrippa II was the last reigning prince of the house of the Herods. In the closing part of the sixth Christian decade, when the Jews made their final revolt against the Roman Empire, Agrippa urged the Jews against such procedure; and when the issue was fully determined upon, the king joined his royal forces against his own subjects. Vespasian first made the invasion of Palestine with the imperial army; but being called to Rome after being proclaimed emperor, he transferred the army to his son Titus to complete the campaign and subjugation of the Jews. In the capture of Jerusalem in the year 70, the Jewish nation was destroyed, the temple was burned, and the survivors were expatriated. King Agrippa's kingdom came to an end.

IV. PRINCESSES OF THE HOUSE OF HEROD.

HERODIAS—BERNICE—DRUSILLA.

These Jewish princesses were not themselves Jewish rulers, but were married to Jewish rulers. By birth they belonged to the royal house of the Herods. In the historical part of the New Testament these princesses are named as associated with specific incidents the mention of which justifies an inquiry as to the historicity of their existence and character. The investigation will complete the evidence furnished respecting the royal house of the Herods, and yield an added interest and evidence to the antiquity and authenticity of the sacred writings.

§ 343. The
Herodian
Princesses.

¹²² *Life of Josephus*, § 11.

¹²³ *Wars*, ii, 15, 1.

I. HERODIAS.

Herodias was granddaughter of Herod the Great and sister of Herod Agrippa I. She first married Herod Philip I, her full uncle, and while he was still living she eloped with her husband's half-brother, Herod Antipas, the tetrarch of Galilee and Peræa, while his wife was yet alive.¹²⁴ The first two Gospels mention "the daughter of Herodias"¹²⁵ who danced before the festive party of nobles when celebrating Antipas's birthday, but do not mention her name, or say that she was the daughter of Herod Philip I. Josephus witnesses that a daughter was born of the first marriage with Philip I, whose name was Salome,¹²⁶ who afterwards became the wife of Herod Philip II, the tetrarch. He also states that Herodias, being a Jewess with a child born to the first marriage, with the Jews, was a bar to a second legal marriage.¹²⁷ Her whole conduct in this matter of elopement was an aggravation to the Jews, particularly unto John the Baptist, the pure and rugged reformer; and the intense indignation aroused was deepened by the fact that Herodias and Antipas were both members of the royal family; and their offense was "sin in high places," the more notorious in that Antipas was conspicuously a ruler of the Jews, who thus defiantly violated the Jewish laws.

The scandalous conduct of these infamous persons is cited in all the Synoptic Gospels; as also the reproof administered to them by John the Baptist for their guilty misconduct. Mark mentions the occasion calling for John's strictures, which was "for the sake of Herodias, his brother Philip's wife; for he married her. For John said unto Herod, *It is not lawful for thee to have thy brother's wife.*" Matthew also reports the same circumstance in nearly the same words. Luke's testimony is briefer and broader: "But Herod the tetrarch being reproved by him for Herodias, his brother Philip's wife, and for all the things which Herod had done."¹²⁸

¹²⁴ *Ant.* xviii, 5, 1. ¹²⁵ *Matt.* xiv, 6; *Mark* vi, 22. ¹²⁶ *Ant.* xviii, 5, 4.

¹²⁷ *Matt.* xiv, 4; *Deut.* xxv, 5; *Levit.* xviii, 16; *xx*, 21.

¹²⁸ *Matt.* xiv, 1-14; *Mark* vi, 14-29; *Luke* iii, 19, 20.

The Synoptic Gospels are in entire accordance with each other in accounting for the origin of the Baptist's reproof of Herod Antipas, the circumstance which led up to John's imprisonment and death. The independent testimony of Josephus is at once an undesigned but significant coincidence in history, remarkably corroborative of the story of the criminal and incestuous marriage of these parties in high life. For Josephus not only fully confirms, but explains in detail the story of the elopement, by giving a circumstantial account of how it was brought about. He says nothing, and probably knew nothing, respecting the reproof administered to Antipas as the ground for the tetrarch's punishing the Baptist with imprisonment and death. Either in ignorance or in suppression of the fact, Josephus omits mentioning it, but attributes the defeat of Herod's army by the Arabian prince, Herod's first father-in-law, as a just judgment of God for having beheaded John.¹²⁹

§ 345. Josephus and the Evangelists.

II. BERNICE.

This princess was the eldest daughter of King Herod Agrippa I, the sister of King Herod Agrippa II, and the wife of that Herod who was the king of Chalcis, "who was both her husband and her uncle." Connected with royalty in all directions by blood and marriage, she was sometimes called a "queen," although she never wore a crown. She is described as a woman of rare personal beauty. Tacitus remarks, "Queen Bernice at that time in the bloom of youth and beauty."¹³⁰ Her husband died in the year 48, when she was but twenty years of age. According to the testimonies of the historians of those times, she retrograded in character, and acquired a bad fame in her relations with different personages—Vespasian, Titus, and even with her own brother Agrippa II.¹³¹ One citation in proof is sufficient. Josephus says of Bernice:

§ 346. Bernice and her Character.

"She lived a widow a long time after the death of Herod, who was both her husband and her uncle. But when the report went out that

¹²⁹ *Ant.* xviii, 5, 1, 2.

¹³⁰ *Hist.* ii, 81.

¹³¹ *Life of Josephus*, § 11; Tacitus, *Hist.* ii, 81; Sueton. *Claudius*, 28.

she had criminal intercourse with her brother, she persuaded Polemo, who was king of Cilicia, to be circumcised, and to marry her, as supposing that, by this means, she would prove these calumnies to be false; and Polemo was prevailed upon, and that chiefly on account of her riches. Yet did not this matrimony endure long, but Bernice left Polemo,"¹³² and is supposed to have returned to the house of her brother.

That Bernice was accustomed to accompany her brother on public occasions on visits of salutations has been already considered. It remains to be remarked that she exerted no little influence on political affairs. This was illustrated when the two went together to Jerusalem, and succeeded for a while in quieting the spirit of rebellion and war among the Jews, who had been terribly exasperated by the illegal procedures and cruelties of the Roman procurator Florus. Having placed Bernice in a gallery overlooking the multitudes, Agrippa made an address with a powerful appeal; and "when Agrippa had thus spoken, both he and his sister wept, and by their tears repressed a great deal of the violence of the people."¹³³ When she went to Cæsarea with King Agrippa, the princess was thirty-two years old, and as she sat at King Agrippa's side, "blazing with all her jewels," they listened to the apostle's powerful address, which seems to have greatly moved both Festus the procurator and King Agrippa, his royal guest.¹³⁴

§ 347. Bernice
and
Cæsarea.

III. DRUSILLA.

Princess Drusilla was the youngest of three daughters of Herod Agrippa I, and was, of course, the sister of Agrippa II and Bernice.¹³⁵ She was but six years old when her royal father died, in A. D. 44. This princess was a celebrated beauty, and, being a Jewess, consented to marriage with Azizus, King of Edessa, upon the express condition of his complying with the required ceremony of becoming a Jew.¹³⁶ Josephus relates the particulars:

"While Felix was procurator of Judæa he saw Drusilla and fell in

¹³² *Ant.* xx, 7, 3; comp. Tacitus, *Hist.* ii, 81; Sueton. *Titus*, vii, and note; Juvenal, *Satires*, vi, 155-157.

¹³³ *Wars*, ii, 16, 1-5.

¹³⁵ *Ant.* xviii. 5. 4.

¹³⁴ See § 342.

¹³⁶ *Ib.* xx, 7, 1, 2.

love with her; for she did indeed exceed all other women in beauty; and he sent to her a person whose name was Simon, one of his friends; a Jew he was and by birth a Cypriot [*i. e.*, of Cyprus], and one who pretended to be a magician; and he endeavored to persuade her to forsake her husband and marry him; and promised that if she would not refuse him, he would make her a happy woman. Accordingly she acted ill, and because she was desirous to avoid her sister Bernice's envy [who was ten years older than herself], for she was very ill treated by her on account of her beauty, was prevailed upon to transgress the laws of her forefathers and marry Felix. And when he had a son by her, he named him Agrippa." ¹³⁷ The mother and son perished in the eruption of Mount Vesuvius in the first year of the reign of Titus, A. D. 79.

As Bernice afterward accompanied Agrippa to Cæsarea, so now Drusilla went with her husband Felix to the same city, curious to see and hear the famous prisoner, the Apostle Paul, whose strange history, lofty per- ^{§ 349. Drusilla and the Scriptures.} sonality, and marvelous powers of eloquence, had made such a deep impression on all the great community of friends and foes. Luke records that—

"After certain days, Felix came with Drusilla his own wife who was a Jewess, and sent for Paul and heard him concerning the faith in Christ Jesus. And as he reasoned of righteousness and temperance and a judgment to come, Felix was terrified, and answered: Go thy way for this time; when I have a convenient season, I will call thee unto me. He hoped withal that money would be given him of Paul [as bribery to purchase his personal freedom]. But when two years were fulfilled, . . . desiring to gain favor with the Jews, Felix left Paul in bonds." ¹³⁸

It is important to keep in sight in this connection the origin and character of Felix, the procurator of Judæa. History represents him as once a slave in Rome, that he had been freed and raised to position and ^{§ 350. Felix her Husband.} power by the weak-minded Claudius, ¹³⁹ and that in his government he evinced all the low instincts of a slave. Dr. Farrar says that—

"Felix had been a slave, in the vilest of all positions, in the vilest of all epochs, in the vilest of all cities." ¹⁴⁰ Tacitus says: "Antonius Felix exercised the prerogatives of a king with the spirit of a slave, rioting in cruelty and licentiousness" ¹⁴¹—"who supposed he might perpe-

¹³⁷ *Ant.* xx, 7, 2.

¹³⁸ *Acts* xxiv, 24-27.

¹³⁹ *Ant.* xx, 7, 1.

¹⁴⁰ *Life and Work of Paul*, ii, 341.

¹⁴¹ *Hist.* v, 9

trate with impunity every kind of villainy.”¹⁴² Suetonius says: “He became in consequence of his elevation the husband of three queens.”¹⁴³

At the time Felix left Paul in bonds at Cæsarea, he had been recalled to Rome by Nero to answer for the cruelties and crimes of his administration in Judæa.

In traversing the evidence for the existence and authority of the Jewish rulers of the house of the Herods and the princes, in all the historical details of persons, places, and times, we have the statements principally of two independent writers. They were the contemporaries of each other, and evidently the contemporaries of the events which they narrate. The one was a Christian evangelist, the other a Jewish historian; the one a friend, and the other an adversary of Christianity. Both were residents in the land whose events and incidents they describe. Each wrote in entire freedom of mind, and without any knowledge of the other, yet their accordancy and accuracy, even to the minutest detail, is something remarkable. Can two other writers of equal antiquity be named who parallel each other in as many details? Now, it is obvious that no writer of a later date could have mentioned, often casually, occurrences of special character, with such sharpness of circumstance, under such frequency of governmental change in the political geography of the land, in part and again in whole, involving such complications without falling into errors, as did Tacitus, Celsus, and Dion Cassius, who lived and wrote somewhat later.* The exact relation of these rulers to the people as subjects, and to the country as realms, are distinctly and accurately stated, but incidentally to another end, by Luke; for he was merely writing biographical memoirs touching the beginnings of Christianity, while Josephus was writing a methodical

* Tacitus substantially dates the death of Agrippa I in 49 instead of 44 (*Annals* xii, 23); Celsus represents that it was “Herod the tetrarch,” instead of Herod the Great, who “sent and slew all the infants, instead of all the male children, born about the same time” (*Orig. contra Cels.* i, 58); and Dion Cassius confuses and confounds the rulers of the Herodian family (*Hist. of Rome*, chapters 49, 53, 55, and 60).

¹⁴² *Annals*, xii, 54.


¹⁴³ *Claudius*, 28.

history of the Jewish nation. The Evangelist gives certain main facts; and every essential particular is confirmed by Josephus, whether the ruler was an ethnarch, a tetrarch, or king over a part or the whole of Palestine; or whether one of the several Roman procurators who ruled in his time was in power over a province. Josephus both corroborates and supplements Luke's record of persons and occurrences. Luke's notices are mostly of personages and events associated with them as pivotal occasions in the early history of the Christian Church; while Josephus gives the circumstances in detail as connected with the Jewish nation. Josephus, accordingly, is quite full in his particularizations respecting him who was the ruler, when he began to rule, the boundaries of his territory, the contentment or contention of his subjects, the principal events occurring under his government, together with some account of the end of his government, whether recalled, deposed, or by death, and what became of the territory during those first fifty years of the Christian era. Besides this confirmation on the part of Josephus, as well as by others—as Tacitus, Suetonius, and Dion Cassius at given points—there is the incontestable substantiation of Luke's statement by numismatic proof, bearing the images and superscriptions upon the several rulers' coins, struck when they were in power. It should be perfectly obvious that no spurious writer could possibly produce a belief favorable to such writing, or escape detection now as an impostor, if he wrote of events, rulers, and realms in that remarkably changeable period. Scientific investigation can neither demand nor supply better *data* in facts for historical induction than are to be found in these writings of the New Testament, related to this period. The same is true of the several Herodian princesses, whose names, character, and conduct have mention on the sacred page. There is no error in matters of fact in the record. Thus by all these minute details, so circumstantially but incidentally introduced by the Evangelist, the Book of Acts is shown to be strictly historical.

TABLE OF THE HOUSE OF THE HERODS.

CONTAINING THE NAMES UNDER DISCUSSION AND IN THE HISTORICAL NEW TESTAMENT.

“ Herod the King;” or, Herod the I; or, Herod the Great.



1. “ Herod the king,” Matt. ii; Luke i, 5.
2. Herod “Archelaus,” Luke xix, 12-27; Matt. ii, 22.
3. “ Herod ” Antipas, “the tetrarch,” Matt. xiv, 1; Mark vi, 14; Luke iii, 1, 19; ix, 7; Mark vi, 14.
4. Herod “Philip” [II.], “the tetrarch,” Matt. xiv, 1, 6; Luke iii, 1, 19; ix, 7; Mark vi, 14.
5. “Herodias,” Matt. xiv, 3, 6; Mark vi, 17.
6. Salome, Matt. xiv, 6; Mark vi, 22, 28; Luke iii, 19.
7. “ Herod ” Agrippa I. “the king,” Acts xii, 1, 2.
8. Herod “Agrippa” II, Acts xxv, 13-27; xxvi.
9. “ Bernice,” Acts xxv, 13, 23; xxvi, 30.
10. “ Drusilla,” Acts xxiv, 24.

COINS OF THE SEVERAL HERODS.

COINS OF THE SEVERAL HERODS.

Fig. 1. COIN OF HEROD THE GREAT—KING, B. C. 37—B. C. 4.

The *Obverse* side or face of the coin represents a helmet with cheek-pieces, also a star above, and the censor of the High Priest. The star is supposed to refer to Herod's conquest of Jerusalem, and the censor borne on the Day of Atonement—the day Herod won his final victory.

The *Reverse* side bears the superscription: ΗΡΩΔΟΥ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ=[Money] of Herod the King, and the monogram P, a contraction of *πρὸς ἄλλο*—the value of the bronze coin. The legend L. Γ. indicates the third year of Herod's reign, when the coin was struck.




Fig. 2. COIN OF HEROD ARCHELAUS—ETHNARCH, B. C. 4—A. D. 6.



Obverse: ΗΡΩΔΟΥ=[Money] of Herod. The device is a leaf and a cluster of grapes.

Reverse: ΕΘΝΑΡΧΟΥ=of the Ethnarch. The device is a helmet.

Fig. 3. COIN OF HEROD ANTIPAS—TETRARCH, B. C. 4—A. D. 39.

Obverse: ΗΡΩΔΟΥ ΤΕΤΡΑΡΧΟΥ =of Herod the Tetrarch. The device is a palm-branch, and the legend L. ΔΓ=33, *i. e.*, A. D. 29.

Reverse: ΤΙΒΕΡΙΑΣ=Tiberias, the capital of the Tetrarchy, written within a wreath; the city built and named by Antipas in honor of the Emperor Tiberius.




Fig. 4. COIN OF HEROD PHILIP II.—TETRARCH, B. C. 4—A. D. 34.




Obverse: ΤΙΒΕΡΙΟΣ ΣΕΒΑΣΤΟΣ ΚΑΙΣΑΡ=Tiberius, Sebastos [=Augustus] Cæsar, whose image accompanies the superscription.

Reverse: ΦΙΛΙΠΠΟΥ ΤΕΤΡΑΡΧΟΥ =Philip the Tetrarch. The device is a temple between whose columns is the legend L. ΑΖ—the year 37, for A. D. 33.

Fig. 5. COIN OF HEROD AGRIPPA I.—KING, A. D. 37-44.

Obverse: ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥΣ ΜΕΓΑΣ ΑΓΡΙΠΠΑΣ ΦΙΛΟΚΑΙΣΑΡ=Agrippa the Great, King, Lover of Cæsar. [See Josephus, Ant. xvii, 5, 1.] The head of Agrippa I.



Reverse: ΚΑΙΣΑΡΙΑ Η ΠΡΟΣ [ΤΩ ΣΕΒΑΣΤΩ] ΔΙΜΕΝΙ=Cæsarea-at-the Harbor of Sebaste=Augustus. The

figure is that of Fortune holding the helm of a vessel, and also a cornucopia.

Fig. 6. COIN OF HEROD AGRIPPA II.—KING, A. D. 50-100.

Obverse: ΝΕΡΩΝ ΚΑΙ[ΣΑΡ]=Nero Cæsar [the Emperor], whose head accompanies the superscription.

Reverse: ΕΠΙ ΒΑΣΙΛΕ. ΑΓΡΙΠΠ. ΝΕΡΩΝΙΕ

= [Issued] by King Agrippa at Neronias (=Cæsarea Philippi), renamed by him in honor of Nero about A. D. 55, on receiving considerable accessions to his dominion.



CHAPTER XVII.
THE JEWISH NATION IN THE TIMES OF THE
NEW TESTAMENT.

I. THE CONDITION OF JEWISH SOCIETY.

1. Sectional Differences.
2. Sectarian Differences.
3. Racial Contentions.
 - α) Spirit of Insubordination.
 - β) Disposition for Conspiracies.
 - γ) Immorality of Conduct.

II. THE DESTRUCTION OF THE JEWISH NATION.

1. False Messiahs and Impostors.
2. Gospel unto all Nations.
3. Beginning of Sorrows.
4. Signs of Warning.
5. Escape of the Christians.
6. Retribution on that Generation.
 - α) A Bank and Wall about Jerusalem.
 - β) City compassed round on Every Side.
 - γ) Tribulation such as never was or shall be.
 - δ) Children dashed to the Ground.
 - ε) Not one Stone left upon Another.

The Sacrifices and Oblation cease.
The Temple at Jerusalem burned.
Jerusalem Itself made Desolate
The Witness of the Infidels.

III. THEY SHALL FALL BY THE EDGE OF THE SWORD.

Retribution upon that Generation.
The Roman Triumphal and Monument.

A REVIEW.

THE PREDICTION.

THE REALIZATION.

THE ADVANTAGES.

CHAPTER XVII.

THE JEWISH NATION IN THE TIMES OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

§ 352. *The Jewish Nation in the Times of the New Testament.*

Upon two foundations, the law of Nature and the law of Revelation, depend all human laws.—WILLIAM BLACKSTONE.

There never was found, in any age of the world, either religion or law that did so highly exalt the public good as the Bible.—FRANCIS BACON.

I find more sure marks of authenticity in the Bible than in any profane history whatever.—ISAAC NEWTON.

Young man, my advice to you is that you cultivate an acquaintance with truth, and a firm belief in the Holy Scriptures. This is your certain interest.—BENJAMIN FRANKLIN.

Let us cling with a holy zeal to the Bible, and the Bible only, as the source of our religion.—JOSEPH STORY.

All human discoveries seem to be made only for the purpose of confirming more and more strongly, the truths contained in the Sacred Scriptures.—SIR JOHN HERSCHEL.

By proving the Record true, Science pronounces it Divine; for who could have correctly narrated the secrets of eternity but God himself? The grand old Book of God still stands, and this old earth, the more its leaves are turned over and pondered, the more it will sustain and illustrate the Sacred Word.—PROFESSOR JAMES D. DANA.

It is impossible rightly to govern the world without God and the Bible.—GEORGE WASHINGTON.

If we abide by the principles taught in the Bible, our country will go on prospering and to prosper. My heart has always assured me, and reassured me, that the Gospel of Jesus Christ must be a Divine reality.—DANIEL WEBSTER.

Christ predicted the destruction of Jerusalem, the overthrow of the Jewish State, and the forfeiture of its rank and privilege as the seat of the worship of Jehovah. When the city stood in all its strength and splendor, he set the date of its downfall within the lifetime of the generation then on the stage.—PROFESSOR GEORGE P. FISHER.

For the nation and kingdom that will not serve Thee shall perish: yea, those nations shall be utterly wasted.—ISAIAH.

ARGUMENT.

The condition of the Jewish nation in the time of Christ described with reference to its differences: Racial, Sectional, and Sectarian. The morals of the people indicated as exemplified in their spirit of insubordination, conspiracies, and other immoral conduct. The utterances of Jesus Christ on the Mount of Olives, respecting Jerusalem and the Jews, predicting, with exactness of circumstantiality, the destruction of the temple, and the overthrow of the nation and its religious institutions, which would be accompanied with untold miseries incurred by rulers and subjects alike within that generation, whose greatest crime consisted in their crucifixion of their own MESSIAH KING.

As was foretold, false Messiahs arose and disappeared; signs of warning of the approaching catastrophe were given and unheeded; the apostles escaped these afflictions, so that not a hair of their heads perished as they fled to the mountains. Then began the "beginning of sorrows," that "great tribulation, such as was not from the beginning of the world; no, nor ever will be." This prediction literally fulfilled, in every detail given, by the conquering Romans under Titus in the Christian year 70. The Prediction, the Realization, and the Advantages accruing to mankind, as seen in the Retrospect of nineteen centuries.

1. The Character and Condition of the Jews in the time of Jesus Christ.
2. The Destruction of their Commonwealth, and the Wretchedness incurred.
3. The Prophecy, the Realization, and the Advantages to Mankind accruing.

I. THE CONDITION OF THE JEWS.

During the period when most of the New Testament was written, the Jews were one people in race, in religion, in institutions, and in customs. For centuries the Jews had been set apart as the chosen people of God, through whom the world was to be blessed; the recipients of God's promises, the repositories of his law, the exemplars of the only true religion on earth, through whom the Messianic Redeemer was to descend for the salvation of mankind. The government of the nation, intended to be theocratic, was invested in a hierarchy located at Jerusalem,

§ 353. A Nation
and
Hierarchy.

and known as *the Great Sanhedrin*.¹ It was both a legal and administrative Senate, called in the New Testament "the Council," and exercised great power over the people in Palestine who worshiped in the temple, and also exerted no little influence upon the Jews who were "*the Dispersed*"² abroad among the nations who worshiped in the synagogues. In the Talmud this body of men was styled "*the House of Judgment*."³ The national institution at Jerusalem was called "*the Great Synagogue*," in distinction from the numerous synagogues of less character throughout the country charged with the care of the local interests of the Jews in that community.

Rabbinical writers refer the origin of this institution to the Seventy Elders chosen by Moses⁴ for his assistance in the administration of the affairs of Israel in the wilderness. But this rabbinical account of the origin is quite probably mythical. The Sanhedrin was organized of scribes, and elders of the Church; in number seventy or seventy-one. The president of the body was called *Nasi*.⁵ The vice-president was styled "*the father of the House of Judgment*,"⁶ who sat on the right hand of the president; and the next lower in rank was the "*wise man*,"⁷ who prepared on both sides the given case, and brought it before the Sanhedrin for trial. He sat on the left side of the president. There were also two *secretaries* or notaries,⁸ one of whom recorded the reasons for acquittal, and the other recorded those for condemnation. The president, who in dignity represented the civil and religious interests of the nation, sat on a platform, with the vice-president on his right hand, and the referee on his left. The notaries stood, one on the right, and the other on the left of the presi-

§ 354. Organization of the Sanhedrin.

¹ סנהדרין גדולה (*συνέδριον*=Sanhedrin), Talmud, *Sanhedr.* i, 5, the supreme council.

² John vii, 35.

³ בית דין

⁴ Numb. xi, 16, 17 (*Sanhedr.* i, 6).

⁵ נשיא, a leader, in Christ's time the high priest.

⁶ אב בית דין

⁷ חכם a sage.

⁸ סופרי הדינים

dent. Three rows of disciples sat before them. The members of the Sanhedrin—priests, elders, and scribes—were seated on low cushions, in a semi-circle according to age and learning, so that all could be seen by the chief officers.

The function of this Senate of wisdom and learning was legislative, judicial, and administrative. As early as B. C.

§ 355. Function of the Sanhedrin. 47, when Herod the Great was yet but procurator of Galilee, he was summoned before the Sanhedrin because he had usurped the authority of that body by putting men to death;⁹ a circumstance indicating that at that time they claimed and possessed the power of life and death. But when Archelaus was deposed from his ethnarchy and banished from Judæa, "Caponius, one of the equestrian order among the Romans, was sent as a procurator, having the power of [life and] death put into his hands by Cæsar."¹⁰ The Jews claim that they relinquished this right,¹¹ but the claim is probably fictitious, for it was made a matter of law. To Pilate they openly confessed in reference to Jesus: "It is not lawful for us to put any man to death." The Sanhedrin had the power to arrest a supposed criminal, and to try and condemn him as worthy of death; but they could not execute their own sentence upon him,¹² for the reason that they had been deprived of that power. The case of Stephen¹³ was an illegal procedure, as was also the martyrdom of "James the Just," our Lord's brother. Probably both were put to death during an interim between the death of Festus and the arrival of Albinus, when there was no procurator present in Judæa.¹⁴

The place where the Sanhedrin sat in deliberation is called in the Talmud *Gazzith*,¹⁵ which was a hall supposed to be located near the southeast corner of one of the courts of the temple; but sometimes they met at the house of the high priest.¹⁶ In the time of Christ's ministry the body of Sanhedrists was re-

⁹ *Ant.* xiv, 9, 4.

¹⁰ *Wars*, ii, 8, 1; *Ant.* xviii, 1, 1.

¹¹ *Tal. Abodah Zara*, f. 8, 2.

¹² *Matt.* xxvi, 66; *John* xviii, 31.

¹³ *Acts* vii.

¹⁴ *Ant.* xx, 9, 1, 2.

¹⁵ *Sanhedr.* x.

¹⁶ *Matt.* xxvi, 8.

moved from the temple, and was located elsewhere on Mount Moriah;¹⁷ and after the destruction of Jerusalem, the Sanhedrin met at Tiberias, on the west side of the Sea of Galilee.¹⁸

The references to the great Sanhedrin in the New Testament are numerous. Before that body Jesus was indicted on several counts, for being a "false prophet," for uttering "blasphemy," and for "perverting the nation."¹⁹ John and Peter were arraigned as false teachers;²⁰ and Paul as "a seditionist," "and a ringleader of the sect of the Nazarenes;"²¹ while Stephen was charged with having spoken against the law of Moses and against the temple.²² Paul was placed before the Sanhedrin by the Roman officer "to know the certainty whereof he was accused by the Jews," when Ananias the high priest ordered him to be smitten on the mouth with the iron heel of a shoe, as an act of supreme contempt for his having made a profession of conscientiousness respecting his life.²³

§ 357. The Sanhedrin and the New Testament.

By reason of the Babylonian captivity and the return of only two tribes, various distinctions arose among the Jews respecting their rights and mutual recognition, one ground of which was sectional differences. The geographical lines of Palestine limited the Jewish nation known as *the Hebrews*; a patronymic referring to Abraham, the progenitor of the Jewish race, having crossed the river Euphrates when he immigrated to the promised land of Palestine. "*Israelite*" was the term used to designate a Jew among his brethren, as "Hebrew" was used among other nations. But those Jews who were scattered abroad and did not constitute a part of the nation were called "*the Dispersion*;"²⁴ while in the New Testament they were called, not

§ 358. Differences of Sections.

¹⁷ *Tal. Avoda Zara*, 1; *Gemara Bab. ad Sanhedr.* v.

¹⁹ John xi, 47; Matt. xxvi, 65; Luke xxiii, 2.

²¹ *Ib.* xxiv, 5.

²² *Ib.* vii.

²⁴ John, vii, 35.

¹⁸ Lightfoot.

²⁰ Acts iii, iv.

²³ *Ib.* xxii, 30; xxiii, 1, 2.

Greeks, but "*Grecians*" or "*Grecian Jews*."* Those dispersed abroad among different nations spoke the Greek language, which was another point of difference. That ancient Hebrew spoken by their ancient ancestors was lost to the Jews during their Babylonian captivity, and was replaced by a dialect of the Chaldee known as the Syro-Chaldaic or later Aramæan tongue, which thence became the vernacular of the Palestinian Jews, now known as "the Hebrew." Three languages were spoken in Palestine in the time of Christ,—the Latin, which was the language of the court; the Greek, which was the common commercial language of the nations; and the Hebrew, which was the vernacular of the Jews.

The Jews of Palestine had their temple for religious services, while those of the "Dispersion" were not excluded therefrom, but had among the nations their synagogues as places of worship. Foreign Jews recited their Greek sentences and read their Sabbath lessons from the Pentateuch or the prophets in the Greek Septuagint, according to Rabbi Elias Levita, or from the Hebrew Scriptures, by means of an interpreter, according to Lightfoot and Vitranga and the Talmudists. The Talmudists say that, in the Law, only one verse was read at a time for fear of a mistake, but three verses were read by the reader at a time when an interpreter translated them.

These differences of locality and language gave rise to narrow prejudices, greatly to the disadvantage of those of the Dispersion. It was made a matter of Talmudic record that "the Jewish offspring of Babylon is more valuable than that

* In the New Testament a distinction is observed, Ἕλλην being rendered *Greek*, and Ἑλληνιστής, *Grecian*. The difference of the English termination, however, is not sufficient to convey the difference of meanings. Ἕλλην in the New Testament is either a Greek by race, as in Acts xvi, 1-3; xviii, 17; Rom. i, 14; or more frequently a *Gentile*, as opposed to a Jew (Rom. ii, 9, 10, etc.); so fem. Ἑλληνίς, Mark vii, 26; Acts xvii, 12. Ἑλληνιστής (properly "one who speaks Greek") is a foreign Jew; opposed, therefore, not to Ἰουδαῖος, but to Ἐβραῖος, a home-Jew, one who dwelt in Palestine." (Smith's *Bible Dictionary*, Vol. II, Hackett's edition, p. 967, first column).

in Judæa itself.”²⁵ Rabbi Levi Ben-Chaiatha, upon hearing some Jews on their way to Cæsarea reciting sentences in the Law in Greek, disallowed it on account of the language; upon the hearing of which, Rabbi Jose, with much indignation, demanded: “If a man does not know how to recite in the holy tongue [the Hebrew], must he not recite them at all? Let him perform this duty in what language he can.”²⁶ The Hellenistic Jews, speaking the Greek language as *their* vernacular, were regarded as the inferiors of the Palestinian Jews who spoke the Hebrew or later Aramæan. The Babylonian Talmud was esteemed as much superior to that of Jerusalem. Josephus, who wrote his *Histories* in the Greek language, states the prejudice of his countrymen against the Greek thus:

§ 360. Differences begot Disadvantages.

“Our nation does not encourage those that learn the language of many nations, and so adorn their discourses with the smoothness of their periods, because they look upon this sort of accomplishment as common, not only to all kinds of freedmen, but to as many servants as may choose to learn them. But they give him the testimony of being a *wise man* who is fully acquainted with our laws, and is able to interpret their meaning.”²⁷

During the period of the Roman-Jewish war the Talmudists recorded a decree prohibiting a father teaching his son the Greek philosophy, under a ban:

“Cursed is the man who teacheth his sons the wisdom of the Greeks.”²⁸ “Rabbin Simeon, the son of Gamaliel, is made to say: ‘There were a thousand in my father’s school [*i. e.*, Hillel’s], of whom five hundred learned the Law, and five hundred the wisdom of the Greeks; and there is not now one of the last alive excepting myself and my uncle’s son.’”²⁹

The meaning of this extraordinary statement is, that God vindicated the “curse” of the decree issued by the Sanhedrin

²⁵ Lightfoot, *Hebraic and Talmudic Exercit.* Vol. II, p. 967.

²⁶ *Tal. Jerus. Sota*, fol. xxi, 2.

²⁷ *Ant.* xx, 11, 2.

²⁸ *Bava Kam.* fol. 82, 2; and *Mishna, Sota*, 9, 14.

²⁹ *Gemâra, Bav. Kam.* f. 82, and *Sota*, f. 40, 1, in Lightfoot, *ii*, p. 660.

against Greek letters and learning; nevertheless, there was one qualification admitted: "They allowed the family of Rabbin Gamaliel the Greek learning, because it was allied to the royal blood." With such prejudice and contempt for the language which had become the vernacular of the Jews of the Dispersion, it is easy to infer the self-asserted superiority of the "home-Jew" for his brother born in a foreign land.

These historical circumstances and distinctions indicated are not only in entire agreement with the Scriptures, but are notably preserved and incidentally interwoven with the very text. The principal points to be observed are the universal "*Dispersion*" of the Jewish race among the nations, the *several appellations* designating the Palestinian and the foreign Jews, and the worship of the *Synagogue* in place of that of the Temple as a necessity. These facts, as being already existent, are particularized in the dedication of the Sacred Writings, in the practical work of the apostles, no less than in the ministry of Christ.

α) The Jews asked among themselves: "Will he go unto the Dispersion among the Greeks, and teach the Greeks?"³⁰ James dedicates his Epistle³¹ "To the Twelve Tribes which are of the Dispersion." Peter, in his first Epistle,³² addresses "The elect who are sojourners of the Dispersion in Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia."

β) Paul wrote to the Corinthians: "Are they Hebrews? So am I. Are they Israelites? So am I. Are they the seed of Abraham? So am I."³³ To the Philippians he wrote: "Circumcised the eighth day, of the stock of Israel, of the tribe of Benjamin, a Hebrew of the Hebrews."³⁴ That is, to the brethren abroad he made himself known by the familiar name of *Israelite*; to the Gentile nations as a *Hebrew*; and to *all*, as "*a Hebrew of the Hebrews*," meaning that there was no proselyte blood coursing in his veins.

γ) *In Asia*, Paul and Barnabas "came to Antioch in Pisidia,

³⁰ John vii, 34, 35. ³¹ Epis. i, 1. ³² 1 Pet. i, 1. ³³ 2 Cor. xi, 22. ³⁴ Phil. iii, 5.

and went into the synagogue on the Sabbath-day, and sat down,"³⁵ and on invitation Paul preached. At Iconium they "entered together into the synagogue of the Jews, and so spake that a great multitude both of Jews and Greeks believed."³⁶ Also in *Europe, as in Asia*, Paul and Silas "came to Thessalonica, where was a synagogue of the Jews."³⁷ At Athens, Paul "reasoned in the synagogue with the Jews and devout persons."³⁸ At Corinth "he reasoned in the synagogue every Sabbath, and persuaded Jews and Greeks."³⁹ And at the great Pentecost at Jerusalem, there were present "Jews, devout men from every nation under heaven."⁴⁰

Josephus states that—

"The Jewish nation is widely dispersed over the habitable earth among its inhabitants."⁴¹ "A very sad calamity now befell the Jews that were in Mesopotamia, and especially those that dwelt in Babylonia."⁴²

In agreement with the facts cited, Luke records an item of history respecting the early Christians at Jerusalem:

"Now in these days when the number of the disciples was multiplying, there arose a murmuring of the Grecian Jews against the Hebrews, because their widows were neglected in the daily ministrations."⁴³

The dispersion of so large a portion of the Jewish population is thus shown to be historical, corroborating the references to the condition of the Jews abroad made in the New Testament. But the non-intercourse of the home and the foreign Jews; the loss of "the holy tongue" as the popular vernacular on the part of the dispersed; the substitution therefor of the Greek, which in Palestine was placed under the ban of a curse; the self-conscious superiority assumed by the "home-Jew" in his relation to the daily temple-service; his being under the government of the Sandedrin, which was so revered,—these, and other circumstances of like character,

³⁵ Acts xiii, 14.

³⁸ *Ib.* xvii, 17.

⁴¹ *Wars*, vii, 3, 3.

³⁶ *Ib.* xiv, 1.

³⁹ *Ib.* xviii, 4.

⁴² *Ant.* xviii, 9, 1.

³⁷ Acts xvii, 1.

⁴⁰ *Ib.* ii, 5.

⁴³ Acts vi, 1.

explain the narrow bias felt towards the brethren of the "Dispersion," as well as the partiality and injustice practiced towards the widows of the Jewish Christians, calling for a Board of Administration to be organized, in which Philip the Evangelist and Stephen occupied a conspicuous place.

The sects of the Jews have prominence in sacred history. The principal divisions were the Pharisees, the Sadducees, and the Essenes, the last of which are not mentioned in the New Testament. They were not a distinct class of *persons*, but with a distinct set of *beliefs*. The Pharisees were distinguished chiefly for their maintenance of the doctrine that man possessed a spirit; that the spirit is immortal; that the body will have a resurrection; and they further held that oral traditions, which they claimed had descended from the ancient elders of Israel in the time of Moses, were equally binding upon the Jews with their Scriptures. The Sadducees originated about B. C. 160-143 under Jonathan, successor to Judas Maccabæus,⁴⁴ and were distinguished for their rejection of that doctrine believed by the Pharisees. Each sect had its own institution of learning at Jerusalem, founded to maintain and advance its own faith. Hillel represented the Pharisees, whose head was the famous Rabban Gamaliel and his renowned descendants. Shammai represented the views of the Sadducees. These two sects were ever in open contention; so that it passed into a proverb, "That even Elijah the Tishbite would not be able to reconcile the adherents of Hillel and Shammai."⁴⁵

The Pharisees were most prominent in the account of the Gospels, and were the more severely dealt with by Jesus because they made obligatory their self-imposed "*traditions*;"⁴⁶ but the Sadducees were noted for their fierce character, and the Sadducean high priest Caiaphas and his father-in-law Annas maliciously extorted from Pilate the death-warrant of Christ. However, after the crucifixion and the claim made by the

§ 362. Jewish
Sects and the
New Testa-
ment.

⁴⁴ *Ant.* xiii, 10, 6; xviii, 1, 4.

⁴⁵ *Kitto*.

⁴⁶ *Matt.* xxiii.

Christian Jews of Christ's resurrection, the Pharisees no longer appear in the foreground of persecution of the apostles, as if in some measure sympathizing with Christian doctrine.⁴⁷ Once the Sadducees attempted to entrap Jesus by proposing a question of a man who had had seven wives in succession, whose husband would he be in the resurrection. But Jesus "put the Sadducees to silence."⁴⁸

This Jewish historian says:

"At this time there were sects among the Jews: . . . the one was called the sect of the Pharisees, another the sect of the Sadducees."⁴⁹ "The Pharisees have delivered to the people a great many observances by succession from their fathers which § 363. Josephus are not written in the law of Moses; and for that reason and these Sects. it is that the Sadducees reject them, and say that we are to esteem those observances to be obligatory which are in the written Word, but not to observe what are derived from the tradition of our fathers. And concerning these things it is that great disputes and differences have risen among them."⁵⁰ The Pharisees "believe that souls have an immortal vigor in them;" that "there will be rewards and punishments according as they have lived virtuously or viciously in this life;" that the wicked will be "detained in an everlasting prison," but the righteous "shall have power to revive and live again." "But the doctrine of the Sadducees is this, that souls die with the bodies."⁵¹ "The behavior of the Sadducees one toward another is in some degree wild, and their conduct with those of their own party is as barbarous as if they were strangers to them."⁵²

Paul makes distinct claim to being a Pharisee, educated "at the feet of Gamaliel,"⁵³ "exceedingly zealous for the traditions" of his fathers;⁵⁴ "as touching the law a Pharisee."⁵⁵ In the Sanhedrin he said: "I am a Pharisee, a son of a Pharisee."⁵⁶ But for his pharisaic traditions, we should never have known that it was "Jannes and Jambres" who "withstood Moses" before Pharaoh.⁵⁷

In the time of Christ's ministry there existed hereditary enmity between the Jews and the Samaritans, the origin of which dated centuries earlier. The Samaritans were a mixed

⁴⁷ Comp. Acts v, 17, 34-40, and xxiii, 6-9.

⁴⁸ Matt. xxii, 25-34.

⁴⁹ Ant. xiii, 5, 9; Wars, ii, 8, 2.

⁵⁰ Ant. xiii, 10, 6.

⁵¹ Ant. xviii, 1, 3, 4.

⁵² Wars, ii, 8, 14.

⁵³ Acts xxii, 3.

⁵⁴ Gal. i, 14.

⁵⁵ Phil. iii, 5.

⁵⁶ Acts xxiii, 6-8.

⁵⁷ 2 Tim. iii, 8; comp. Ex. vii, 11; viii, 17-20, etc.

race of Assyrian descendants and renegade Jews, and others of foreign extraction. During the period of the Babylonian captivity, the Samaritans ravaged and occupied Jewish estates; and upon the return of the two tribes the Jews excluded them from all participation in the temple. The Samaritans were called the "adversaries of Judah and Benjamin."⁵⁸ This racial dislike and hostility are more than intimated in several passages in the Gospels. The woman at Jacob's well said unto Jesus: "How is it that thou, being a Jew, askest drink of me who am a woman of Samaria; for the Jews have no dealings with the Samaritans?"⁵⁹ In another instance the Lord, with his disciples, was journeying toward Jerusalem, and a certain Samaritan village refused to accord the usual rights of sacred hospitality, for this express reason:

"Because his face was as though he were going to Jerusalem. And when his disciples saw this, they said: Lord, wilt thou that we bid fire come down from heaven and consume them, even as Elijah did? But he turned and rebuked them, and said: Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of."⁶⁰

A more opprobrious term the Jews could not employ against Jesus than this: "Say we not well that thou art a Samaritan, and hast a devil?" Of the ten lepers cleansed by Jesus, only one returned to him "to give glory to God," "and he was a Samaritan."⁶¹

Josephus confirms the enmity and antagonism existing between these two peoples when he mentions how the Samaritans "distressed the Jews, cutting off parts of their land and carrying off slaves;"⁶² how the Samaritans attacked the Galileans who were journeying to Jerusalem to their festivals, passing through Samaria, when many Jews were killed;⁶³ and withal, how the Samaritans stole into the city by night and "threw about dead men's bodies in the cloisters" of the temple, "on which ac-

⁵⁸ *Ezra* iv, 1, etc.⁵⁹ *John* iv, 9.⁶⁰ *Luke* ix, 51-55.⁶¹ *John* viii, 48; *Luke* xvii, 15-18.⁶² *Ant.* xii, 4, 1.⁶³ *Id.* xx, 6, 1; *Life of Josephus*, § 52.

count the Jews afterward excluded them out of the temple, which they had not been used to do at such festivals.”⁶⁴ These instances sufficiently illustrate and demonstrate the ancient animosity existing between these two races, occupying the country of Palestine, and more than verify as historical the fact so briefly and incidentally alluded to in the Gospels.

It is a sad indictment of the characteristics of the Jews of that period, which Josephus makes against his own people concerning their contumacious spirit, their disposition to conspiracies, and their general practices of immoralities. His deliverance on these points are suggestive of the tone and trend of one who was himself a witness, or was otherwise well assured of the facts involved in what he narrates.

§ 365. The
Jewish
Characteristics.

a) *A Spirit of Insubordination.* Matthew relates how the Pharisees in behalf of the Jews, and the Herodians in behalf of the Romans, conspired together to ensnare Jesus, when they approached him with a proposition for his answer which they intended should deprive him of his influence over the Jews, or, on the other hand, cause him to forfeit his life for treason to the Romans. After the most flattering words they said:

“Tell us therefore, What thinkest thou: is it lawful to give tribute unto Cæsar or not? But Jesus perceived their wickedness and said: Why tempt ye me, ye hypocrites? Show me the tribute money. And they brought unto him a penny. And he saith unto them, Whose is this image and superscription? They say unto him, Cæsar’s. Then saith he unto them: Render unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar’s. and unto God the things which are God’s. And when they heard it, they marveled, and left him and went their way.”⁶⁵

Luke records the speech of the famous Gamaliel in defense of the apostles before the Sanhedrin, when he said:

“Before these days rose up Theudas, giving himself out to be somebody; to whom a number of men, about four hundred, joined themselves, who were slain; and all, as many as obeyed him, were dispersed and came to nought. After this, rose up Judas of Galilee in the days of the enrollment, and drew away some of the people after him; he also perished, and all, as many as obeyed him, were scattered abroad.”⁶⁶

⁶⁴ *Ant.* xviii, 2, 2.

⁶⁵ *Matt.* xxii, 15-33.

⁶⁶ *Acts* v, 35-39.

At this point several things are to be kept in sight:

1. That, historically, the Jewish nation was divided as to the right and policy of resisting the imperial government in taxing the Jewish estates; a fact evidenced by the question submitted to Christ for his decision by the mutually opposing parties touching the legitimacy of that measure.

2. That the *time* of this taxing was in the *second* enrollment of Cyrenius, which occurred in A. D. 6 corrected, or A. D. 10 of our present current chronology; his *first* enrollment having been taken B. C. 4, when Christ was born, which was of the Jews' *population*; the second of their *property*,⁶⁷—and there is no account whatever of any other enrollment afterwards.

3. That it was the enforcement of this taxation upon property which was the occasion for the open revolt of Judas of Galilee, referred to by Gamaliel, and passed as understood by the Sanhedrists as historical, when the apostles were before them for examination respecting the facts and doctrines which they were preaching.

4. We have no other account of *this* particular Theudas named by Gamaliel, whose revolt dates *prior* to the enrollment of Cyrenius, since "*after this man rose up Judas of Galilee in the days of the enrollment,*" of whom Josephus gives considerable information and confirmation. Nevertheless, he narrates particulars of a *later* Theudas, an impostor, whose exploits occurred in the procuratorship of Cuspius Fadus (A. D. 44–46), who was slain with many others.⁶⁸

Josephus authenticates the case of a Judas as occurring under the procuratorship of Coponius, which was A. D. 6–9 corrected chronology. He says:

"Coponius, also a man of the equestrian order, was sent to have the supreme power over the Jews. Moreover, Cyrenius came himself into Judæa . . . to take an account of their substance. There was one Judas, a Gaulonite, of the city, whose name was Gamala, who, taking

⁶⁷ See § 59 (γ).

⁶⁸ *Ant.* xx, 5, 1

with him Sadduc, a Pharisee, became zealous to draw them to a revolt, who both said that this taxation was no better than an introduction to slavery, and exhorted the nation to assert their liberty."⁶⁹ "The sons of Judas of Galilee were now slain; I mean that Judas who caused the people to revolt when Cyrenius came to take an account of the estates of the Jews, as we have shown in a foregoing book."⁷⁰

β) *A Disposition for Conspiracies.* This characteristic spirit of the Jews illustrated itself in the time of the apostles, when "the Jews banded together and bound themselves with a curse, saying that they would neither eat nor drink till they had killed Paul; and they were more than forty who made this conspiracy."⁷¹ But the conspiracy was detected and defeated by the apostle's nephew, "Paul's sister's son."

It is mentioned in Jewish history that a similar conspiracy was organized against the life of Herod the Great in the early part of his reign, on account of his having introduced strange and heathen customs among the Jews and forced them upon the people. "Ten men that were citizens [of Jerusalem] conspired together against him, and sware to one another to undergo any dangers in the attempt; and took daggers with them under their garments" for the purpose of killing Herod. But the plot was detected, exposed, and the parties implicated suffered death.⁷²

These instances are sufficient to illustrate the character and condition of the Jews at that period. The case of Paul is interesting in that the conspirators boldly approached the chief priests and Sanhedrists, the highest judicial body of the Jews and rulers of the nation, seeking their complicity by co-operation in this self-confessed plot to assassinate a man for the crime of being a Christian; a fact which naturally recalls an earlier conspiracy, conceived in deadly malice, and culminating in the crucifixion of the Son of God.

γ) *Immorality of Conduct.* We are indebted to one who was himself a Jew and a priest and historian of the Jews for

⁶⁹ *Ant.* xviii, 1, 1; *Wars*, ii, 8, 1; *Ib.* vii, 8, 1.

⁷⁰ *Ant.* xx, 5, 2.

⁷¹ *Acts* xxiii, 12-16. ⁷² *Ant.* xv, 8, 3, 4.

the following terrible arraignment of his brethren who were his contemporaries. Josephus thus witnesses:

“That was a time most fertile in all manner of wicked practices, insomuch that no kind of evil deeds were then left undone; nor could any one so much as devise any bad thing that was new; so deeply were they all infected and strove with one another, in their single capacity and their communities, who should run the greatest lengths in impiety towards God, and in unjust actions toward their neighbors; the men of power oppressing the multitude, and the multitude earnestly laboring to destroy the men of power. The one part were desirous of tyrannizing over others; and the rest offering violence to others, and plundering such as were richer than themselves.”⁷³

He further makes a record touching the iniquities of his brethren to the effect that “no city ever suffered such miseries,” “no age, since the beginning of the world,” “ever bred a generation more fruitful in wickedness;” that they overthrew the city and forced the Roman army to come and make a conquest of their nation, and that they drew the fire which consumed the temple of God at Jerusalem. Then, as a final arraignment, he adds:

“I suppose that had the Romans made any longer delay in coming against these villains the city would either have been swallowed up by the ground opening upon them, or been overflowed by water, or else been destroyed by such thunder-[storms] as the country of Sodom perished by; for it brought forth a generation of men much more atheistical than were those that suffered such punishments; for by their madness it was that all the people were destroyed.”⁷⁴

II. THE DESTRUCTION OF THE JEWISH NATION.

The Lord Jesus, having wept over Jerusalem, left the temple accompanied by his disciples, and ascended the slopes of the Mount of Olives to the east of the city, over opposite the sacred courts. From this point the Holy City was to be seen at the greatest advantage, overlooking the walls. His disciples directed his attention to the magnificence of the buildings which adorned the sacred grounds of the temple. Jesus there gave utterance to

§366. Predic-
tions of
Jesus Christ.

⁷³ Wars, vii, 8, 1.

⁷⁴ Ib. v, 13, 6.

that which was at once one of the most marvelous, as well as most momentous, predictions that ever fell from prophetic lips, or found verification in human history. It was his prophecy of the desolation of Jerusalem, the destruction of the temple, involving the overthrow of the Jewish nation, the expatriation of the people, and the discontinuance of the theocracy. As the distinguished historian Milman remarks:

“The distinctness, the minuteness, the circumstantial accuracy with which the prophetic outline of the siege and fall of Jerusalem is drawn, bear, perhaps, greater evidence of more than human foreknowledge than any other in the sacred volume.”⁷⁵

The Prediction: “And Jesus went out of the temple and was going on his way, and his disciples came unto him to show him the buildings of the temple. . . . And as he sat on Olivet the disciples came unto him privately, saying: Tell us when will these things be? And what will be the sign of thy coming, and of the end of the world?”⁷⁶

“And as some spake of the temple, how it was adorned with goodly stones and offerings, he said: As for these things which ye behold, the days will come in which there shall not be left one stone upon another that shall not be thrown down! And they asked him, saying: Master, when shall these things be, and what will be the sign when these things are about to come to pass?”⁷⁷

Obviously here are *two distinct questions asked*, and two different replies given. Matthew gives prominence to *the signs of Christ's coming* at “the end of the world.” Luke gives prominence to *the destruction of the temple*, when “there shall not be left one stone upon another.” To avoid confusion of understanding respecting which event is referred to in the twofold answer returned, the two lines of thought related to the two subjects of Christ's prediction should be carefully discriminated. The present discussion is interested only in the proposition appertaining to *the overthrow of the Jewish theocracy, including all that that conveys*, so circumstantially foretold and historically fulfilled. This is restricted to the destruction of Jerusalem and the Jewish nationality. The Synoptic Gospels contain the complete record of this conver-

⁷⁵*Hist. of Christianity*, Vol. I, 311.

⁷⁶Matt. xxiv, 1-3.

⁷⁷Luke xxi, 5-7.

sation, at least so far as transmitted to us.* The following particulars may be elicited from these Scriptures:

1. There would first arise many false Messiahs and impostors.
2. But the Gospel would first be published unto all the nations.
3. Then would be realized by the Jews "the beginning of sorrows."
4. The final calamities would be preceded by certain signs.
5. Of the Christians, not a hair of their heads should perish.
6. And all these things would occur within the generation then living.

How far this deliverance of Christ was realized when the Jews were destroyed in their theocracy and state, remains to be verified by the witness of both Jewish and pagan historians who were unfriendly to the Christian religion.

FALSE MESSIAHS AND IMPOSTORS.

The Prediction: "Jesus answered and said: Take heed that no man lead you astray, for many will come in my name saying, I am the Christ, and will lead many astray, . . . and many false prophets will arise and lead many astray. Then if any man shall say unto you: Lo, here is Christ, or there, believe it not; for there will be many false Christs and false prophets, and will show great signs and wonders, so as to lead astray, if possible, the very elect." "Behold I have told you all things beforehand."⁷⁸

The Fulfillment: Josephus in his *Histories* records the circumstantial realization of this prediction. The evidential events selected occurred under the procuratorship of Cuspius Fadus, A. D. 44-46; Claudius Felix, 50-58; and Portius Festus, 58-60.⁷⁹ The destruction of the Jewish theocracy and commonwealth culminated in the capture and desolation of Jerusalem in the year 70.

a) "Now it came to pass while Fadus was procurator of Judæa, that a certain magician whose name was Theudas persuaded a great part of the people to take their effects with them, and follow him to the river Jordan; for he told them that he was a prophet, and that he would by his own command divide the river [Jordan], and afford them an easy passage over it; and

* Mark states that the disciples who engaged privately in this conversation with Christ were Peter, James, John, and Andrew (xiii, 3).

⁷⁸ Matt. xxiv, 4, 5, 11, 23, 24; comp. Mark xiii, 5, 6, 23.

⁷⁹ Thomas Lewin.

many were deluded by his words.”⁸⁰ But Theudas was captured and beheaded, and many of the deluded ones were slain.

β) “Now as for the affairs of the Jews, they grew worse and worse continually, for the country was again filled with robbers who deluded the multitude. Yet did Felix catch and put to death many of the impostors every day.” “And now these impostors and deceivers persuaded the multitude to follow them into the wilderness, and pretended that they would exhibit manifest wonders and signs that should be performed by the providence of God.”⁸¹

γ) “So Festus sent forces, both horsemen and footmen, to fall upon those that had been seduced by a certain impostor who promised them deliverance and freedom from the miseries they were under, if they would follow him as far as the wilderness. Accordingly, those forces that were sent destroyed both him that deluded them, and those that were his followers also.”⁸²

In these citations no mention is made by Josephus of “false Christs” as such; nevertheless, he does call them false prophets, deceivers, and impostors; and many of them promised to deliver the Jews from the oppressions and distresses which they suffered under the Roman domination, which was the popular expectation to be realized in the coming of the Christ. So that, not in the form of words, but in the reality, they verified Christ’s prediction of “false prophets” who would “arise and lead many astray.”

THE GOSPEL GIVEN TO ALL NATIONS.

The Prediction: “And the gospel shall first be published unto all nations.”⁸³ “And this gospel of the kingdom shall be published in the whole world, for a witness unto all nations; and then shall the end come.”⁸⁴

The Fulfillment: In Paul’s apostolate he preached the gospel personally in Antioch, in Syria; at Paphos, in the island, Cyprus; at Antioch, in Pisidia; Iconium, Lystra, § 368. The Gospel and the Roman World. and Derbe, in Lycaonia; at Perga and Ephesus, in Asia Minor; in Philippi, Thessalonica, Berea, Athens, Corinth, and Rome, in Europe; as well as in Cæsarea and Jerusalem, in Palestine. To many of these cities he addressed epistles full of Christly instruction. So that this man’s

⁸⁰ *Ant.* xx, 5, 1.

⁸¹ *Jb.* xx, 8, 5, 6; comp. further *Wars*, ii, 13, 4, 5; vi, 5, 2, 3.

⁸² *Ant.* xx, 8, 10.

⁸³ *Mark* xiii, 10.

⁸⁴ *Matt.* xxiv, 14.

apostolical labors more than justified his own affirmation that—

“For I will not dare to speak of any of those things which Christ wrought not through me, for the obedience of the Gentiles, by word and deed, in the power of signs and wonders in the power of the Holy Ghost; so that from Jerusalem, and round about even unto Illyricum, I have fully preached the gospel of Christ; yea, making it my aim so to preach the gospel, not where Christ was already named, that I might not build upon another man’s foundation; but as it is written: They shall see to whom no tidings of him came; and they who have not heard, shall understand.”⁸⁵

In the same epistle Paul declares of the Christians, that “their faith is proclaimed throughout the whole world.”⁸⁶ The Apostle Peter also addressed his first epistle to the Christians resident in Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia and Bithynia. And at the great Christian Pentecost at Jerusalem, there were present “Jews, devout men from every nation under heaven,” who were “confounded, because that every man heard them speaking in his own language.” And they said:

“How hear we every man in our own language wherein we were born? Parthians and Medes and Elamites, and the dwellers in Mesopotamia, in Judæa and Cappadocia, in Pontus and Asia, in Phrygia and Pamphylia, in Egypt and parts of Libya about Cyrene, and sojourners from Rome, both Jews and proselytes, Cretans and Arabians, we do hear them speaking in our tongues the mighty works of God.”⁸⁷

Eusebius, referring to the Emperor Tiberius having proposed to the Roman Senate the name of Christ to be enrolled among the gods of the State, quotes from the *Apology* of Tertullian before the government in the Christians’ behalf, the following:

“Tiberius therefore, under whom *the name of Christ was spread throughout the world*, when this doctrine was announced to him from Palestine, where it first began, communicated with the Senate, being obviously pleased with the doctrine.”⁸⁸

Tacitus testifies that Christianity, “the pernicious superstition, repressed for a time, broke out again, not only through

⁸⁵ Romans xv, 18-21.

⁸⁶ *Ib.* i, 8.

⁸⁷ Acts ii, 5-11.

⁸⁸ *Eccl. Hist.* ii, 2; comp. Tertullian’s *Apology*, *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, iii, pp. 21, 22.

Judæa where the mischief originated, but through the city of Rome also.”* About forty-two years after the subjugation of Palestine by Titus, Pliny the younger was appointed governor of Bithynia. Upon his accession to power he found the Christians so numerous in Asia Minor that he sought to suppress the religion by either recantation or extermination; and he sought the advice of his emperor, Trajan, affirming that the course would expose to danger “many of every age, and of every rank, and of either sex.”⁸⁹ He feared for the stability of his government over the province. To have attained such place and power in a community, the gospel must have been preached there within the limits of that generation when the prediction was uttered.

THE BEGINNING OF SORROWS.

The Prediction: “And there shall be famines and earthquakes in divers places. But all these things are but the beginning of travail.”⁹⁰ “And there shall be great earthquakes, and in divers places famines and pestilence.”⁹¹

The Fulfillment: These phenomena of nature, which occurred during that generation, were very marked as regards both frequency and severity. Luke records the prediction of the Prophet Agabus respecting a famine which occurred in the reign of Claudius; a famine which lasted through several years and spread far and wide.⁹² Eusebius also refers to it, and remarks:

§369. Predicted
Famine
Historical.

“In his reign there was a famine that prevailed over the whole world; an event which has been handed down by historians [who are] very far from our doctrine; and by which the prediction of the Prophet Agabus, recorded in Acts of the Apostles, respecting the impending famine over the whole world, received its fulfillment.”⁹³

But there are other historical notices of prevailing famine. Josephus confirms Luke’s account, by relating how that, at that time, Queen Helen relieved Jerusalem by furnishing food for the hungry in the stress of famine;⁹⁴ Dion Cassius, in his his-

* *Ann.* xv, 44.

⁸⁹ *Epis. to Trajan*, x, 97.

⁹² *Acts* xi, 28.

⁹⁰ *Matt.* xxiv, 7, 8.

⁹³ *Eccles. Hist.* ii, 8.

⁹¹ *Luke* xxi, 11.

⁹⁴ *Ant.* xx, 2, 5; xx, 5, 2.

tory, also mentions the famine as severely afflicting Rome and all Italy.⁹⁵ Tacitus remarks the fact, affirming "a failure in the crops," which was "regarded as a prodigy, and that, "It is certain that there was then in Rome provision for only fifteen days."⁹⁶ Suetonius mentions "a scarcity of provisions occasioned by bad crops for several successive years," on account of which the populace thronged about and abused the emperor, threatening personal violence, he with "some difficulty escaping into the palace by a back door!"⁹⁷

Josephus relates that about the year 40 "a pestilence came upon those at Babylon" from which the Jews suffered extremely. And during the siege of Jerusalem, there "came a pestilential destruction upon them, and soon after such a famine as destroyed them more suddenly."⁹⁸ As regards earthquakes,

§370. Pesti-
lence and
Earthquakes
Historical.

Eusebius mentions three cities, "Laodicea, Hieropolis, and Colosse, which were overthrown by earthquakes."⁹⁹ Tacitus states that "Many prodigies happened this year; . . . frequent earthquakes occurred."¹⁰⁰ Seneca also mentions this great calamity,¹⁰¹ which occurred about A. D. 62 or 63. Tacitus adds:

"This year . . . was by the gods branded with storm and pestilences." He mentions a whirlwind whose "violence extended so far as the neighborhood of the city of Rome, in which a terrible pestilence was sweeping away every living thing, without any discernible derangement of the atmosphere, though the houses were filled with the dead, and the streets with funerals. Neither sex nor age was exempt from danger; bondmen and free were snatched off indiscriminately, amid the wailing of wives and children, who, while they were yet attending and lamenting them, were themselves seized and frequently burned on the same funeral pile."¹⁰²

§371. Wars
and Tumults
Historical.

Along with the disturbances in the course of nature were the disturbances of human society, by reason of tumults and wars experienced in that generation, which begot sorrows.

⁹⁵ *Hist. of Rome*, i, 49, 60.

⁹⁸ *Wars*, vi, 9, 3.

¹⁰¹ *Quaest. Nat. Q.* vi, 1.

⁹⁶ *Annals*, xii, 43.

⁹⁹ *Chron.* p. 161.

¹⁰² *Annals*, xvi, 13.

⁹⁷ *Claudius*, xix.

¹⁰⁰ *Annals*, xii, 43.

The Prediction: "And ye shall hear of wars and rumors of wars. See that ye be not troubled, for these things must needs come to pass; but the end is not yet. For nation shall rise up against nation, and kingdom against kingdom."¹⁰³ "But when ye shall hear of wars and tumults, be not terrified: for these things must needs come first; but the end is not immediately."¹⁰⁴

The Fulfillment: About the year 40, at Seleucia, the Greeks and Syrians united against the Jews; "they fell upon them and slew about fifty thousand of them; nay, the Jews were all destroyed excepting a few who escaped."¹⁰⁵ Cuspius Fadus, having become procurator of Judæa (44-46), "found quarrelsome doings between the Jews that dwelt in Peræa and the people of Philadelphia, about their borders at a village called Mia, that was filled with men of warlike temper; for the Jews of Peræa had taken up arms, . . . and had destroyed many of the Philadelphians."¹⁰⁶ A celebrated quarrel and tumult arose under Cumanus (48-50), between the Jews and Samaritans, resulting in the killing of many on both sides, the crucifixion of some, and the deposing and banishment of Cumanus himself.¹⁰⁷ In a contest between the Jews and Syrians, "the daytime was spent in slaughter, and the night in fear," until "the cities were filled with dead bodies."¹⁰⁸ "Those of Askelon slew twenty-five hundred, and those of Ptolemais two thousand; those of Tyre put a great many to death, but kept a greater number in prison."¹⁰⁹ In Damascus, ten thousand unarmed Jews were slain in a gymnasium, in one hour's time.¹¹⁰ "Above thirteen thousand Jews were killed" in a night, and plundered of all they had.¹¹¹ At Cæsarea, in one hour's time, twenty thousand Jews were slain, "and all Cæsarea emptied of its Jewish inhabitants." Thereupon the Jewish nation arose and destroyed about fifteen cities, and many of the villages near these cities they plundered, together with an immense slaughter of men in the villages.¹¹² At Alexandria, "fifty thousand of them [the Jews] lay down

¹⁰³ Matt. xxiv, 6, 7.

¹⁰⁵ *Ant.* xviii, 9, 9.

¹⁰⁹ *Ib.* ii, 18, 5.

¹⁰⁶ *Ib.* xx, 1, 1.

¹¹⁰ *Ib.* ii, 20, 2.

¹⁰⁴ Luke xxi, 9, 10.

¹⁰⁷ *Ib.* xx, 6, 1-3.

¹¹¹ *Ib.* ii, 18, 3.

¹⁰⁸ *Wars*, ii, 18, 2

¹¹² *Ib.* ii, 18, 1.

upon heaps, nor had the remainder been preserved had they not betaken themselves to supplication."¹¹³ A Roman soldier offering a gross and vulgar insult to the Jews at the Passover at Jerusalem, a furor was raised, and the Roman army stationed at the garrison Antonia were summoned to quiet the tumult, and twenty thousand Jews were killed, which caused mourning throughout the nation.¹¹⁴

Tacitus, in opening his celebrated Roman History, alluding to Servius Galba and his first consulship (A. D. 33) and afterwards, says:

"The period before me is fertile in vicissitudes, pregnant with sanguinary encounters, embroiled with intestine dissensions, and in the intervals of peace, deformed with horrors. Four princes put to death; three civil wars; with foreign enemies more; and in some conjunctures, both at once; Italy afflicted, moreover, with calamities unheard of, or occurring after a long series of ages; cities overwhelmed or swallowed up by earthquakes in the fertile country of Campania; Rome laid waste by fire; her most ancient temples destroyed; the Capitol itself wrapped in flames by the hands of citizens; . . . the sea crowded with exiles; the rocks stained with blood of murdered citizens; Rome itself a theater of still greater horrors. . . They carried rapine and plunder in every direction, impelled by personal hate and armed with terror."¹¹⁵

Such is but a part of the melancholy picture of the times, fulfilling the prediction of Jesus respecting "the beginning of travail" to be experienced by that generation before the final catastrophe comes.

THE SIGNS OF WARNING.

The Prediction: "When ye see Jerusalem compassed with armies, then know that her desolation is at hand. Then let them that are in Judæa flee unto the mountains; and let them that are in the midst of her depart out; and let not them that are in the country enter therein. For these are the days of vengeance, that all things which are written may be fulfilled." "And not a hair of your head shall perish."¹¹⁶ "When ye see the abomination of desolation which was spoken of by Daniel the prophet standing in the Holy Place, let them that are in Judæa flee to the mountains; let him that is upon the housetop not come down to take out the things that are in the house; and let him that is in the field not return back to take his cloak."¹¹⁷

¹¹³ Wars, ii, 18, 8.

¹¹⁴ Ant. xx, 5, 3.

¹¹⁵ Hist. B. i, 2.

¹¹⁶ Luke xxi, 18-22.

¹¹⁷ Matt. xxiv, 15-18; Mark, xiii, 14.

By "abomination of desolation" is meant the abomination which desolates—a Hebraism. The reference is to the Roman eagles borne by the Roman soldiery at the head of the several legions, and were the objects of Roman worship, by which also they took their oath of loyalty to the empire, but were the objects of detestation to the Jews. The eagles, therefore, became the symbols of the victors. Now, the Jews were taught that they were prohibited by the Mosaic "Commandments" from countenancing any made or graven image of anything in heaven or earth; and the Roman eagles were "images."¹¹⁸ As images led to idolatry, the Jews' susceptibilities were extremely sensitive on this point, and they would not suffer the presence of these standards even in Jerusalem, if they could avoid it, much less within the inclosure of the temple grounds. On one occasion Pilate thought to impose his eagles upon this people by stealthily bringing them into the city by night; but upon the discovery of it there was a tumult raised which he could not repress; and he felt necessitated to remove them back to his headquarters at Cæsarea-on-the-Sea.¹¹⁹ Once Herod the Great dedicated a large golden eagle to the temple, placing it upon the great gate to the entrance, when one Matthias, one of the men of eloquence and great interpreters of the law, instigated pulling it down and destroying it; for which Matthias was burned alive as a seditious by the king's orders.¹²⁰ So Vitellius, president of Syria, to whose dominions Judæa was attached, while marching his army through the Jews' country to attack Aretas, the king of Petræa, was prevailed upon by the earnest protest of the principal Jews to bear his eagles by another route.¹²¹ Now, because of the general but not universal apostasy from God, the Roman eagles, however much an "abomination" to Jewish taste and instincts, symbolized the Roman power which was to destroy

§ 372. "The Abomination of Desolation."

¹¹⁸ *Ant.* xvii, 6, 2.

¹²⁰ *Ant.* xvii, 6, 2-4.

¹¹⁹ *Ib.* xviii, 3, 1; *Wars*, ii, 9, 2, 3.

¹²¹ *Ib.* xviii, 5, 3.

Jerusalem and the temple, and "stand in the holy place" as "the abomination which desolates" the sacred places of their worship.

The Fulfillment: The time had come in that generation when a military movement was inaugurated against the Jews, by which the Christians of that community should cognize the signs of warning, and make good their escape from the sufferings to come. Jesus had said: "When ye see Jerusalem compassed with armies, then know that her desolation is at hand." "And not a hair of your head shall perish." For certain reasons, Cestius Gallus, president of Syria, marched his army to the Holy City and besieged it. This was the first investment of Jerusalem. Josephus relates that this brief siege was made in the twelfth year of Nero (54-68), which would be in the year 66 A. D. of the current Christian era;* and that, after burning certain portions of the city, Cestius pitched his camp over against the royal palace. He adds:

"Had he at this very time attempted to get within the walls by force he had won the city presently, and the war had been put an end to at once." "And now it was that a horrible fear seized upon the seditious [Jews] insomuch that many of them ran out of the city as though it were to be taken immediately." . . . But instead, "he recalled his soldiers from the place, and despairing of any expectation of taking it, without receiving any disgrace, *he retired from the city without any reason in the world.*" "After this calamity had befallen Cestius, *many of the most eminent of the Jews forsook the city as men do a sinking ship.*"¹²²

This was the opportune moment for the escape of the Jewish Christians of that community from the awful calamities which were to come in the near future. The day for which they had watched and waited, as Christ had admonished them, was now at hand; for, as remarked by Dr. Philip Schaff:

"The Christians of Jerusalem, remembering the Lord's admonition, forsook the doomed city in good time, and fled to the town of Pella

* Eusebius places the escape before the war under Titus (*πρὸ τοῦ πολέμου*), which agrees with the above date—four years before the destruction of Jerusalem in A. D. 70.

¹²² *Wars*, ii, 19, 6, 7; and note, and ii, 20, 1.

in the Decapolis, beyond the Jordan, in the north of Peræa, where Herod Agrippa II, before whom Paul once stood, opened to them a safe asylum. An old tradition says that a divine voice, or angel, revealed to their leaders the duty of flight. There, in the midst of a population chiefly Gentile, the Church of the Circumcision was reconstructed. Unfortunately, its history is hidden from us. But [the city] never recovered its former importance. When Jerusalem was rebuilt as a Christian city, its bishop was raised to the dignity of one of the four Patriarchs of the East, but it was a patriarchate of honor, not of power, and sank to a mere shadow after the Mohammedan invasion.¹²³

Eusebius, the author of the first Christian history which has been handed down to us, gives the following account of the exodus of the Christians from Jerusalem :

“The rest of the apostles, who were harassed in innumerable ways with a view to destroy them, and driven from the land of Judæa, had gone forth to preach the gospel to all nations, relying upon the aid of Christ, when he said: ‘Go ye, teach all nations in my name.’ The whole body, however, of the Church at Jerusalem, having been commanded by a Divine revelation, given to men of approved piety there before the war, removed from the city, and dwelt in a certain town beyond the Jordan called Pella. Here those that believed in Christ having removed from Jerusalem, as if holy men had entirely abandoned the royal city itself and the whole land of Judæa, the Divine Justice for their crimes against Christ and his apostles finally overtook them, totally destroying the whole generation of these evil-doers from the earth.”¹²⁴

Epiphanius, who lived a little earlier,¹²⁵ mentions the Christians dwelling in Jerusalem, as being warned by Christ of the approaching siege and removing to Pella, being warned by an angel; and in another book he speaks of the return of the Christians thence afterwards, when Hadrian had rebuilt the city, calling it by his own name, *Ælia Colonia*. As respects the failure of the Jews pent up in Jerusalem to regard the signs of the approaching doom which was about to destroy the temple and city, and to overthrow and displace their apostate nation for having crucified the Christ of God, Josephus, though not conscious of that cause, remarks:

“It is not possible for men to avoid fate, although they may see it beforehand. But these men interpreted some of these signs according

¹²³ *Hist. Christ. Church*, 1, 402.

¹²⁴ *Eccl. Hist.* B. iii, 5.

¹²⁵ About A. D. 310, *Hæres Nazaræorum*, c. 7.

to their own pleasure; and some of them they utterly despised, until their madness was demonstrated both by the taking of the city and their own destruction."¹²⁶

ACCOMPLISHED IN THAT GENERATION.

The Prediction: Jesus exposed the sins and hypocrisy of scribes and Pharisees present before the multitude, as the leaders of the apostate people; yet with sympathy and tenderness did he even weep and lament as he predicted the doom impending over that generation, which meant the complete destruction of the nation. He said:

§375. Day of Vengeance in that Generation.

"Behold, I send unto you prophets and wise men and scribes; some of them ye will kill and crucify; and some of them ye will scourge in your synagogues, and persecute from city to city; that upon you may come all the righteous blood shed on the earth, from the blood of Abel the righteous unto the blood of Zachariah son of Barachiah, whom ye slew between the sanctuary and the altar. Verily I say unto you, all these things shall come upon this generation.

"O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, which killeth the prophets, and stoneth them that are sent unto her! How often would I have gathered thy children together even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and ye would not! Behold, your house is left unto you desolate!"¹²⁷

"And when he drew nigh he saw the city and wept over it, saying: If thou hadst known in this day, even thou, the things which belong unto peace! but now they are hid from thine eyes. For the days shall come upon thee when thine enemies shall cast up a bank¹²⁸ about thee, and compass thee round, and keep thee in on every side, and shall dash thee to the ground, and thy children within thee; and they shall not leave in thee one stone upon another; because thou knowest not the time of thy visitation." "For these are the days of vengeance, that all things which are written may be fulfilled. . . . And they shall fall by the edge of the sword, and shall be led captive into all the nations; and Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles, until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled. . . . But when these things begin to come to pass, look up, and lift up your heads; because your redemption draweth nigh. . . . Verily I say unto you, This generation shall not pass away till all things be accomplished. Heaven and earth shall pass away; but my word shall not pass away."¹²⁹

¹²⁶ Wars, vi, 5, 4.

¹²⁷ Matt. xxiii, 34-38.

¹²⁸ Ὁ χάραξ, a palisade; i. e., rows of pales between which earth, stones, and timbers were heaped and packed together as a rampart for defense.

¹²⁹ Luke xix, 41-44; xxi, 22-24, 28, 32, 33.

For clearness of statement, circumstantiality of fulfillment in history, and for tenderness of pathos in the prophet, the Scriptures contain no parallel to this prediction of Christ. It seems remarkable that no apostle or Evangelist makes any reference to the terrible calamities denounced against that generation, especially as the destruction of the temple is mentioned by heathen and Jewish historians who were contemporary with the event described. Barnabas, the Apostolic Father, who wrote A. D. 70-79, states that the temple was destroyed accordant with the purpose of God, by the enemies of the Jews, through war. But such mention of the catastrophe only renders the more conspicuous the neglect of the sacred writers. But the satisfactory explanation is to be found in the fact that *the Synoptic Gospels and all the Epistles were written some years prior to the fulfillment of the prediction, and not one was a witness of the event.* These Gospels contain the *prediction*, but not its *realization*. According to Clement of Alexandria (b. 150), Matthew continued his stay at Jerusalem with the other apostles, busy with his countrymen for a period of twelve years after the crucifixion of Christ. After that they were abroad, "teaching all nations," accordant with their great commission. When, then, the Evangelists had recorded the prophecy, their work was done; and the realization and vindication of the prediction was left to its development in history and record by those who were enemies of Christ. Josephus and the Talmudists on the part of the Jews, and Tacitus, Suetonius, and Dion Cassius on the part of the heathen historians, witness to the historical fulfillment of Christ's prediction respecting the destruction of Jerusalem and its temple.

The Fulfillment: The prophecy contains several specific predictions, the evidence of whose circumstantial realization may now be considered in detail.

§ 376. Particulars in the Prediction.

a) "*For the days will come when thine enemies will cast a bank about thee.*"

Josephus says that,

Titus "ordered that they should bring timber together, and raise banks against the city. . . . He placed those that shot darts and the archers in the midst of the banks that they were then raising."¹³⁰ "So now Titus's banks were advanced a great way."¹³¹

β) "*And they will compass thee round and keep thee in on every side.*"

Alford, in his *Greek Testament*, says: "When the Jews destroyed this [military palisade] Titus built a wall around them, to which the Lord tacitly refers."¹³²

Tacitus says:

"Such was the city and such the nation against which Titus Cæsar determined to act by means of mounds and mantelets; such being the nature of the locality, it was adverse to assault and sudden attack."¹³³

Josephus says that Titus told his officers that,

"They [the Romans] must build a wall about the whole city, . . . the only way to prevent the Jews from coming out in any way . . . that, besides this wall, . . . he would take care then to have the banks raised again. These arguments prevailed with the commanders. So Titus ordered that the army should be distributed to their several shares of the work. . . . Now, the length of the wall was forty furlongs, one only abated [nearly five miles long]. . . . The whole was completed in three days, . . . in so short an interval of time as is incredible. . . . So all hope of escape was now cut off from the Jews, together with all liberty of going out of the city."

"When Titus had therefore encompassed the city with this wall, and put garrisons into proper places, he went round the wall at the first watch of the night, and observed how the guard was kept; the second watch was allotted to Alexander; the commander of legions took the third watch."¹³⁴

γ) "*For there shall be great tribulation, such as there hath not been since the beginning of the world until now, no, nor ever shall be.*"¹³⁵

Josephus continues:

"Then did the famine widen its progress, and it devoured the people by whole houses and families; the upper rooms were full of women and children dying of famine; and the lanes of the city were full of dead

¹³⁰ Wars v, 6, 2.

¹³¹ *Ib.* v, 11, 1.

¹³² *Commentary on Luke* xix, 43, in Vol. I, 625

¹³³ *Hist.* v, 13.

¹³⁴ Wars. v, 12, 1, 2; comp. Isa. xxix, 1-8.

¹³⁵ Matt. xxiv, 21; Mark xiii, 19.

bodies of the aged; the children also, and the young men wandering about the market-places like shadows, all swelled with famine, and fell down dead wheresoever their misery seized them. . . . Nor was there any lamentation made under these calamities, nor were heard any mournful complaints; but the famine confounded all natural passion; for those who were just going to die looked upon those who were gone before them with dry eyes and open mouths. A deep silence also, and a kind of deadly night, had seized upon the city."¹³⁶

δ) "*They shall dash thee to the ground, and thy children within thee.*"

Josephus continues the story of the siege in fulfillment of Christ's prediction:

"Many of the eminent citizens told [Titus that] . . . the entire number of the poor that were dead [were] no fewer than six hundred thousand [who] were thrown out of the gates, though still the number of the rest could not be discovered; and they told him, further, that when they were no longer able to carry out the dead bodies of the poor, they laid the corpses on heaps in very large houses, and shut them up therein."¹³⁷

"Manneus, the son of Lazarus, came running to Titus, . . . and told him that there had been carried out through that one gate which had been intrusted to his care, no fewer than one hundred and fifteen thousand, eight hundred and eighty dead bodies."¹³⁸ "Simon took the tower into his own custody, and seized upon these men [whom he suspected of treachery], and put them to death in the sight of the Romans; and when they had mangled their bodies, *he threw them down before the wall of the city.*"¹³⁹ "Now the seditious at first gave orders that the dead should be buried out of the public treasury, as not enduring the stench of their dead bodies. But afterwards, when they could not do that, *they cast them down from the walls into the valleys beneath.*"¹⁴⁰

ε) "*And they will not leave in thee one stone upon another, because thou knewest not the day of thy visitation. For these are the days of vengeance, that all things which are written may be fulfilled.*"

The siege is drawing near its crisis and close. Josephus, himself a Jewish commander, but now captured yet allowed large privileges at the headquarters of the Roman army, becomes an eyewitness of the final overthrow of the Jews at Jerusalem. In his *Histories*

§ 377. Beginning of the Desolation.

¹³⁶ Wars, v, 12, 3. ¹³⁷ Ib. v, 13, 7. ¹³⁸ Ib. v, 13, 7. ¹³⁹ Ib. v, 13, 2, close.
¹⁴⁰ Ib. v, 12, 3, close.

he says that, "This war began in the second year of the government of Florus [as procurator], and the twelfth year of the reign of Nero," which was also the seventeenth year of Herod Agrippa II, corresponding to May A. D. 66.¹⁴¹ It was in the month of July of that year that Titus made a night assault, surprising the Jews and capturing the castle Antonia. This was a great gain, making easy the early capture of the temple.

On the seventeenth of the same month "the daily sacrifice failed at the altar of burnt-offerings, for the want of men to offer it; and the people were grievously troubled at it." According to Whiston, this fact was the literal fulfillment of Daniel's prediction made 606 years previously, but now the realization is brought to pass by Titus: "*And for the half of the week he shall cause the sacrifice and the oblation to cease;*" "for from the month of February, A. D. 66, about which time Vespasian entered on this war to this very time, was just three years and a half." On learning of the discontinuance of the Jews' sacrifice, Titus himself informed John, one of the Jewish chiefs, "that he might, if he pleased, offer the sacrifices which were discontinued, by any of the Jews whom he might pitch upon." He also had Josephus appeal to them in the same manner. But John* was incorrigible, and replied "that he never did fear the taking of the city, because it was God's own city." Josephus replied:

"But thou hopest to have God for thy supporter in this war, whom thou hast deprived of his everlasting worship; and thou imputest those sins to the Romans who at this very time, take care to have our laws observed, and almost compel those sacrifices to be offered to God which by thy means have been intermitted."¹⁴²

* The three Jewish chieftains were *Simon son of Gioras*, who commanded fifteen thousand men occupying Mount Zion; *John of Gischola*, with six thousand Sicarii or robbers and others, occupied Acra on the north, and the outer temple courts; while *Eleazar son of Simon*, the treasurer of the temple, commanded two thousand four hundred men in the inner courts of the temple. These three camps were implacable in hate for each other, and fought desperately when not engaged with the Romans, their common enemy.

¹⁴¹ *Ant.* xx, 11, 1; see *Lard.* vi, p. 407.

¹⁴² *Wars*, vi, 2, 1, and notes; comp. *Dan.* ix, 27.

Now it is a marvelous fact that the Mosaic sacrifices have never been resumed, from the seventeenth of July A. D. 70 until this day!

Josephus relates: "So Titus retired to the tower Antonia, resolved to storm the temple the next day early in the morning with his whole army, and to encamp round the Holy House. But as for that house, God had for certain doomed it to the fire; and now the fatal day was come, according to the revolution of the ages. It was the tenth day of the month Lous [Ab, *i. e.*, August] upon which it was formerly burnt by the king of Babylon." (B. C. 588; viz., Nebuchadnezzar; and also B. C. 63, by Pompey the Great.)¹⁴³

§379. The
Temple
Burned.

The storming party of the Romans were successful in capturing the sacred grounds, and all hope of the Jews died in them.¹⁴⁴ In their fright, they forsook their own walls which seemed almost impregnable, upon which the battering rams of the enemy had thundered for six days without making any impression.¹⁴⁵ The contending factions, led by Simon and John, betook themselves to flight, but could not effect their escape owing to the wall and soldiery of the Romans surrounding the city. Many concealed themselves in the caves and caverns beneath the temple and elsewhere, within the area of the outer walls. The streets and houses were filled with the dead everywhere. The spectacle was that of complete desolation and solitude created in the midst of a city; so that in the final onset, when the Romans mounted the ramparts, they were amazed at the silence and ruin which had been wrought by famine, flames, and death.¹⁴⁶ All that was now left for the Jews to do, was for each one to make the best terms he could for his own surrender.

In noting these events, Dion Cassius remarks "a certain superstitious respect" which the Jews entertained for the walls of the temple, who thought "themselves happy in being employed to fight for their temple, or die near it;" but that when they saw their sanctuary in flames,

¹⁴³ Wars, vi, 4, 5.

¹⁴⁴ *Ib.* vi, 4, 2.

¹⁴⁵ *Ib.* vi, 4, 1; vi, 8, 4.

¹⁴⁶ *Ib.* vi, 8, 5.

“Some surrendered themselves, some yielded to be killed, some cast themselves into the fire; “and it was truly imagined by all, but especially by those persons [interested], that it was not death, but to be both a victory and a deliverance and a complete happiness that they might perish along with the temple. And, at all events, so truly others were captured, even bar-Gioras their leader; and, indeed, he alone in the triumphal procedures was punished with death. *So assuredly Jerusalem was utterly destroyed on that day of Saturn [i. e., Saturday], which even yet now do the Jews reverence.*”*

§380. Jerusalem Captured. The city itself, however, was captured the 8th day of September, A. D. 69.† Josephus now expresses this melancholy reflection:

“A city that had been subject to so many miseries during the siege that, had it always enjoyed as much happiness from its first foundation, it would have certainly been the envy of the world. Nor did it on any other account so much deserve the sore misfortune as by producing such a generation of men as were the occasion of this overthrow.”¹⁴⁷

Suetonius mentions that Titus, having been left by his father Vespasian to “finish the reduction of Judæa, in his final assault of Jerusalem, . . . took it upon his daughter’s birthday.”¹⁴⁸

The city of Jerusalem was now left in shapeless ruins. The temple, with its wealth of associations and treasures of gold, was reduced to ashes. The whole aspect of the sacred courts was a dreary desolation.

§381. Jerusalem a Desolation. The magnificence of those buildings, once pointed out so admiringly by the disciples of Christ, and those others which adorned “Mount Zion, beautiful for situation, the joy of the whole earth, on the sides of the north,” had forever disappeared, “like the baseless fabric of a vision, leaving not a rack behind.” Those massive walls which surrounded and divided the city were leveled to the ground, excepting a portion on the western side, and the three most powerful towers,

* Καὶ εἶδον πάντες, μάλιστα δὲ οἱ ἐκείνοις οὐχ ὅτι θλεθροί, ἀλλὰ καὶ νίκη, καὶ σωτηρία, εὐδαιμονία τε εἶναι, ὅτι τῷ ναφ συναπόλλοιτο. Ἐάλωσαν δ’ οὖν καὶ ὡς ἄλλοι τε, καὶ ὁ Βαρκορᾶς ὁ ἄρχων αὐτῶν· καὶ μόνος γε οὗτος ἐν τοῖς ἐπινικίοις ἐκολάσθη. οὕτω μὲν τὰ Ἱεροσόλυμα ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ τοῦ Κρόνου ἡμέρᾳ, ἣν μάλιστα ἔτι καὶ νῦν Ἰουδαῖοι σέβουσιν, ἐξώλετο. (Lib. lxvi, *Vespas.* §§ 6, 7.)

† Suetonius’ *Lives of the Cæsars*, Titus, p. 469, Note 1.

¹⁴⁷ Wars, vi, 8, 5.

¹⁴⁸ Titus, v.

which had proved to be absolutely impregnable, known as Mariamne, Phasaël, and Hippicus, which are still standing near the gate Yaffa. These had belonged to Herod's palace. After the conquest, these were left purposely as monuments of the complete reduction of the city and the nation.¹⁴⁹ Everywhere throughout the city, in its lanes and streets and courts; underneath, in its subterraneous regions; above ground, in the palaces and homes; outside the walls, and down along the surrounding valleys and ravines,—were found, in heaps and scattering, the bodies of the dead and the dying.

The victorious Romans now brought their standards, surmounted by the detested eagles, into the courts of the temple, and, placing them over against the eastern gate, proceeded to make their customary sacrificial offerings in thanksgiving for the conquest achieved.¹⁵⁰ Then was realized the predicted "*abomination of desolation standing in the holy place.*" "They placed their ensigns upon the towers, and made joyful acclamations for the victory they had gained, as having found the end of the war."¹⁵¹ And to complete their expression of admiration for their commander, the soldiers assumed to bestow upon Titus the title of Emperor. It was merely a complimentary title, for his father Vespasian, under whose authority he was acting, was at that time the emperor.

Centuries before the event, Daniel the prophet had forecast the situation as at length it developed in history. He predicted that—

"The people of the prince that shall come, shall destroy the city and the sanctuary, and the end thereof shall be [as] with a flood, and even unto the end shall be war. Desolations are determined. *He shall cause the sacrifice and the oblation to cease; and upon the wing of abominations shall come one that maketh desolate; and even unto the consummation . . . shall wrath be poured out upon the desolate.*"¹⁵²

Titus now had occasion and time to survey the situation as wrought by famine, pestilence, and war; not only the desola-

§ 382. The Abomination of Desolation.

§ 383. Titus and God.

¹⁴⁹ Wars, vii, 1, 1.

¹⁵⁰Ib. vi, 6, 1.

¹⁵¹Ib. vi, 8, 5.

¹⁵² Dan. ix, 26, 27.

tion effected by the Romans, but that effected within the city by the deadly strifes of the three camps under the leadership of Simon, John, and Eleazar. Nothing remained but "the tattered fragments of departed glory." When he witnessed the ruin and destruction of the city and the temple,—

"He gave a groan, and spreading out his hands to heaven, called God to witness that this was not his [own] doing;"¹⁵³ that "he certainly had God for his assistant in this war;"¹⁵⁴ that "he had himself not done this great work," but "only lent a hand in the service of God when he was pleased to show his displeasure toward that nation;"¹⁵⁵ and that "it was God who put down by force the Jews from their defenses."¹⁵⁶

An eloquent Roman lawyer of an early Christian century, named Minucius Felix, refers the Roman people to Josephus, but also to Antonius Julianus, a Roman author and historian of this Roman-Jewish war, as one

"From whom they might learn that the Jews had not been ruined, nor abandoned of God, until they first had abandoned him; and that their present low condition was owing to their [own] wickedness and obstinacy therein; and that *nothing had happened to them but what had been foretold.*"¹⁵⁷

"*They will not leave in thee one stone upon another.*" The depth of meaning here intended may now receive consideration. This Roman-Jewish war was virtually ended when Jerusalem was captured and destroyed. A few frontier fortresses to which the Jews in flight found refuge remained, and were not all taken until the year 73. Meantime Jerusalem was razed to the ground. Josephus witnesses that—

"Cæsar resolved to leave there as a guard the tenth legion, with certain troops of horsemen and companies of footmen." "*Its wall was so thoroughly laid even with the ground by those that dug it up to the foundation, that there was left nothing to make those that came thither believe it had ever been inhabited.* This was the end which Jerusalem came to by the

¹⁵³ Wars, v, 12, 4.

¹⁵⁴ Ib. vi, 9, 1.

¹⁵⁵ Philostratus de Vit. 1, 6, c. 29, cited by Lard. vi, 478.

¹⁵⁶ Ὁ Θεός ἦν ὁ τῶνδε ἐρμάτων Ἰουδαίους καθελών, Wars, vi, 9, 1; cf. vi, 8, 5.

¹⁵⁷ Cited by Lard. vi, 477.

§ 384. Christ's
Prediction
Fulfilled.

madness of those that were for innovations—a city otherwise of great magnificence and of mighty fame among mankind.”¹⁵⁸

Eusebius records:

“All this occurred in this manner, in the second year of the reign of Vespasian, according to the predictions of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ, who, by his Divine power, foresaw all these things as if already present at the time, who wept and mourned indeed at the prospect as the holy Evangelists show in their writings.” “How can one fail to acknowledge and wonder at the truly divine and extraordinary foreknowledge and prediction of our Savior? Concerning the events, then, that befell the Jews after our Savior’s passion, and those outcries in which the multitude of the Jews refused the condemnation of a robber and murderer, but entreated that the Prince of Life should be destroyed, it is superfluous to add to the statement of the historian [Josephus].” “The occasion of their being so great a multitude of people at Jerusalem . . . was, that it was the time of the Passover, for which reason the Jews, having come up from all parts to worship at the temple, were shut in the city as in a prison. *And indeed it was fit that they should be slain at the same time [i. e., at the Passover time] in which they crucified our Savior.*”¹⁵⁹

Centuries before these calamities were realized, God’s prophets had voiced to this people how that the Divine indignation was unmistakably kindled against them, foretelling the doom which would certainly overtake them if they persisted in their wickedness. Precisely what did occur was that which was predicted with marvelous circumstantiality. Jeremiah, quoting the words of Micah, said:

“Micah the Morasthite prophesied in the days of Hezekiah, King of Judah, and spake to all the people of Judah, saying: *Thus saith the Lord of hosts: Zion shall be plowed like a field, and Jerusalem shall become heaps; and the mountain of the house [of God] as the high places of the forest.*”¹⁶⁰

As to the fulfillment of this repeated prediction of the prophets, *confirmation* is given by the Talmudists, who were adverse witnesses, who refer to a certain Roman captain named Turnus, but called in the Talmud Terentius Rufus, who was left with a guard in charge of Jerusalem in ruins. The Talmud reads:

“On the ninth [of the month] Av, five things happened: It was decreed in the wilderness that Israel should not enter into the land [of

¹⁵⁸ Wars, vii, 1, 1, 2.

¹⁵⁹ Chronicles, 162.

¹⁶⁰ Jer. xxvi, 18; Mic. iii, 12.

promise]. The temple was destroyed both the first and the second time. The great city Bithur was taken, and there were in it thousands and tens of thousands of Israel; and they had a great king, whom all Israel and the greatest of the wise men imagined to be King Messiah. He fell into the hands of the Gentiles, and the Israelites were slain; and there was a great affliction similar to the desolation of the temple. On the same day destined for punishment, the wicked Turnus Rufus *plowed up the sanctuary and the adjacent parts, to fulfill that which is said: Zion shall be plowed as a field.*"¹⁶¹

§ 385. Witness of Infidels. Edward Gibbon, in his celebrated history of the Roman Empire, on the downfall of Jerusalem and its destruction by Titus and Hadrian, says:

"A part of the hill distinguished by the name of Moriah, and leveled by human industry, was crowned with the stately temple of the Jewish nation. After the final destruction of the temple by the arms of Titus and Hadrian, a plowshare was drawn over the consecrated ground, as the sign of perpetual interdiction. Zion was deserted; and the vacant space of the lower city [Mt. Moriah] was filled with the public and private edifices of the Ælian colony, which spread themselves over the adjacent hill of Calvary. The holy places were polluted with monuments of idolatry; and, either from design or accident, a chapel was dedicated to Venus on the spot which had been sanctified by the death and resurrection of Christ."¹⁶²

Volney, one of the extremest of the schools of disbelief, who traversed the lands of the Bible to discover, if possible, evidence with which to invalidate the Scriptures, thus testifies respecting the condition of Judæa:

"I have traversed this desolate country. . . . I wandered over the country; I enumerated the kingdoms of Damascus and Idumæa, of Jerusalem and Samaria." "Great God! from whence proceed such melancholy revolutions? For what cause is the fortune of these countries so strikingly changed? Why are so many cities destroyed? Why is not that ancient population reproduced and perpetuated? . . . Why have these favors been transferred, as it were, for so many ages, to other nations and different climes? . . . Within two thousand and five hundred years we reckon ten invasions, which have introduced in Syria a succession of foreign nations." . . . "God has doubtless pronounced a secret malediction against the land!"¹⁶³

¹⁶¹ Talmud in *Hilchoth Taanioth*, c. v, on Mic. iii, 12.

¹⁶² Milman's ed. of *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, ii, 326; Porter and Coates's ed., Phila., 1845.

¹⁶³ See Keith's *Demonstr. of Truth and Christianity*, pp. 23, 24, 26, etc.

No, not a “*secret* malediction,” but a most public one, pre-announced in prophecy, literally fulfilled in history, and the whole land is now a standing monument of Divine indignation against an apostate and incorrigible nation! It is the terrible retribution of God upon the ancient Jews, brought upon themselves by the high-handed wickedness of that nation which culminated in the rejection and crucifixion of Jesus Christ; a punishment which he foretold would come to pass in that very generation! Jesus himself foretold:

“These are days of vengeance, that all things which are written may be fulfilled.”¹⁶⁴ For “Vengeance is mine; I will repay, saith the Lord.”¹⁶⁵ “For the nation and kingdom that will not serve thee, shall perish: yea, those nations shall be utterly wasted.”¹⁶⁶

§) “*And they shall fall by the edge of the sword; and they shall be led captive into all the nations; and Jerusalem shall be trodden down by the Gentiles, until the time of the Gentiles be fulfilled.*”¹⁶⁷

This part of Christ’s prediction contains three averments; namely, the killed in battle, the prisoners captured, and Jerusalem trodden down by the Gentiles. We shall see that these particulars were realized to the letter. Josephus* estimates the number of Jews assembled at Jerusalem in A. D. 65, when Cestius Gallus attempted the first siege, to have been three millions gathered from all lands to the festival of the Passover. According to the careful computation of Milman, there perished of the Jews—

In different cities prior to the siege at Jerusalem,	- -	129,500
And, besides, during the war conducted in Galilee and Judæa,		118,300
At Jerusalem, by siege, battles between the Jews, famines,		
and pestilence,	- - - - -	1,100,000
After the fall of Jerusalem, at the several forts of the frontier,		8,660
		<hr/>
Total,	- - - - -	1,356,460
Number of prisoners taken at the end of the siege,	97,000	
Prisoners taken at Gischala and the Jordan,	- 4,700	
		<hr/>
		101,700
		<hr/>
Grand total,	- - - - -	1,458,160

¹⁶⁴ Luke *xxi*, 22.

¹⁶⁵ Rom. *xii*, 19.

¹⁶⁶ Isa. *lx*, 12.

¹⁶⁷ Luke *xxi*, 24.

* Wars, *vi*, 9, 3.

Besides, ninety-seven thousand captives were sold into slavery. The aged and infirm who survived the siege were slain. Those whose age was seventeen and above were put into bonds and sent to the mines of Egypt; while others were sent away to Cæsarea, to Berytus (Beyroot), and Antioch in Syria, and to other cities, to be entered in the amphitheater, to be killed by each other or by skilled gladiators, or to be thrown to the wild beasts, as a holiday spectacle [to entertain and amuse the half-civilized populace of that region. But a special reservation was made of the tallest and handsomest young men, together with those regarded as the chieftains in the rebellion—such as John of Gischala, and Simon son of Gioras—to grace the triumph of Titus at Rome. The number of these prisoners is that reported by Josephus from only three places; but there were others not included here. He adds:

“They left only the populace, and sold the rest of the multitude with their wives and children; and every one of them at a very low price; and that because such as were sold were very many, and the buyers were very few.”¹⁶⁸

These cruelties, which are beyond compare, were then justified by the rules of ancient warfare. Upon the other hand, the two alternatives were conspicuously placed before all Israel while yet in the wilderness. Moses taught and educated the people:

“And it shall come to pass, if thou shalt hearken diligently unto the voice of the Lord thy God, to observe to do all his commandments which I command thee this day, that the Lord thy God will set thee on high above all nations of the earth.” “If thou wilt *not* observe to do all the words of this law that are written in this book, that thou mayest fear this glorious and fearful name, THE LORD THY GOD; . . . ye shall be left few in number, whereas ye were as the stars of heaven for multitude; because thou wouldst not obey the voice of the Lord thy God.” “And the Lord shall scatter thee among all people, from one end of the earth to the other, . . . and among these nations shalt thou find no ease, neither shall the sole of thy foot have rest; but the Lord shall give thee a trembling heart, and failing of eyes, and sorrow of mind: and thy life shall hang in doubt before thee; and thou shalt fear by day

¹⁶⁸ *Wars*, vi, 8, 2.

and night, and shalt have none assurance of thy life; in the morning thou shalt say, Would God it were even! and at even thou shalt say, Would God it were morning! for fear of thine heart wherewith thou shalt fear, and for the sight of thine eyes which thou shalt see. And the Lord shall bring thee into Egypt again with ships, by the way whereof I spake unto thee: Thou shalt see it no more again: *and there ye shall be sold unto your enemies for bondmen and bondwomen, and no man shall buy you [back].*"

"The generation to come of your children that shall rise up after you, and the stranger that shall come from a far land, . . . even all the nations, shall say: Wherefore hath the Lord done this unto this land? What meaneth the heat of this anger? *Then shall men say: Because they have forsaken the covenant of the Lord God of their fathers.*"¹⁶⁹

Since the time of the destruction of Jerusalem, there have been Jewish communities, but no Jewish nation or State. From those days until now, neither Jerusalem nor Judæa has ever been in possession of the Jews. The country has changed ownership frequently; for first it was held by the Romans who had conquered it; then by the Saracens who overran it; afterwards by the Franks; then by the Mamelukes; and now it is governed by the Turks who belong to the Mohammedan religion. The Divine prediction had its verification in that generation:

*"For in those days there shall be tribulation, such as there hath not been from the beginning of the creation which God hath created until now, and never shall be."*¹⁷⁰ *"There shall be great distress upon the land, and wrath unto this people; and they shall fall by the edge of the sword; and they shall be led captive into all the nations; and Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles, until the time of the Gentiles shall be fulfilled."*¹⁷¹

If, now, it should be asked, Why should this indignation of God be judicially visited upon this particular "generation" rather than another? the reminder should be made that this generation had the advantages of more light than all the others; the accumulated teachings of all prior generations for two thousand years were theirs, and not one generation with less instruction was so incorrigibly wicked. The culmination of all wickedness

§ 387. Retribution on that Generation.

¹⁶⁹ Deut. xxviii, 1, 58, 62-68; xxix, 22, 24, 25.

¹⁷⁰ Mark xiii, 19.

¹⁷¹ Luke xxi, 23, 24.

occurred in this generation as in no other, when Jesus "came unto his own, and his own received him not,"¹⁷² but when "this generation" of both nation and rulers perpetrated the unparalleled crime against the life of the Christ of God whom they crucified as the vilest criminal. For let it not be forgotten that, after all the miracles which attested his Divine Sonship, he at last wrought the stupendous miracle in their presence in raising Lazarus from the dead, their only response was that they sought to kill both Jesus and Lazarus; for they said: "If we let him alone, all men will believe on him, and the Romans will come and take away our place and nation."¹⁷³ It was "this generation" of both rulers and people who openly committed the deathless infamy of preferring the release of Barabbas, who was a murderer, that the Son of God should be tortured by his death on the cross! Falsely professing loyalty to the Roman Emperor, with one voice they cried out to Pilate: "We have no king but Cæsar; if thou release this man, thou art not Cæsar's friend; every one that maketh himself a king speaketh against Cæsar!" Against Pilate's repeated protest, "*All the people answered: His blood be upon us, and on our children.*"¹⁷⁴ Their fearful imprecation was granted. They preferred Cæsar's rule to that of Christ, and to Cæsar's rule they were relegated. Is not the horrid imprecation of the Jews before Pilate the sufficient and supreme answer to the question why God's retribution fell upon that particular generation? He who is "King of the nations"¹⁷⁵ "shall judge among the nations."¹⁷⁶ The abrupt but complete turning point between the dispensation of the Old and New Testament had now come. The siege of Jerusalem in its succession of events is significant of "*God in History.*" The siege began at the time of the Passover, the anniversary of the crucifixion of Christ; at the time when the predicted "sacrifice and oblation should cease," which was the

¹⁷² John 1, 11.¹⁷⁴ John xix, 12; Matt. xxvii, 25.¹⁷³ *Ib.* xi, 48; xii, 10, 11.¹⁷⁵ Jer. x, 7.¹⁷⁶ Psa. ii, 4, 6; vii, 8; ix, 8.

abolishment of the Jews' whole sacrificial system; the occasion in which their ancient temple was burned to the ground, the utter extinction of their revered center of worship; on a *Saturday*, the abolition of the *Jewish Sabbath*; the reduction and destruction of "the Holy City" Jerusalem; and, withal, the expatriation of the Jewish people from their native Palestine; that which finally terminated the existence of their ancient theocracy! It stands forever as the answer to all questions, and for the understanding of all the generations to come, *that that generation of the Jews in which Jesus Christ lived and died, in their frenzied outcry for the crucifixion of the "Lord of Glory" invoked upon themselves the horrible malediction: "His blood be on us, and on our children!"* The revenge of History was but too fully accomplished. It was the vindication of God. And the Gentile world ever since has read, with wonder and profound sympathy, the story of these calamities endured, which ended in the blotting out from the great family of nations, and the removal from the geography of the world, the nationality and commonwealth of the ancient Jews of Palestine. From that day forth, History was changed in its course.

It is indeed a sad but historical record of the Divine procedure, but one which had been tearfully but faithfully portrayed by Christ himself. It was also long preceded by the longsuffering and "patience of Christ," which should not be lost sight of when taking an account of the *memorabilia* related to his sufferings.

These are :

1. THE SYMPATHY OF JESUS : "And when he drew nigh he saw the city, and wept over it."
2. THE VISITATION OF GOD : "These are the days of vengeance . . . and wrath unto this people."
3. BY METHODS OF WAR : "Jerusalem compassed by armies . . . know her desolation is at hand."
4. EXCRUCIATING SUFFERINGS : "Hath not been the like from creation, and never shall be."

5. THE DESTRUCTION OF THE TEMPLE: "Behold, your house is left unto you desolate."
6. THE ESCAPE OF THE CHRISTIANS: "And not a hair of your heads shall perish."
7. THE OVERTHROW OF THE CITY: "Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles."
8. THE CONDITION OF SURVIVORS: "And they shall be led captive into all the nations."
9. THE PERVERSITY OF THE JEWS: "Because thou knowest not the days of thy visitation."
10. THE CHRISTIANS EMANCIPATED: "Lift up your head, because your redemption draweth nigh."

The Roman triumph is the sequel of this conquest, involving further humiliating sufferings on the part of the Jews.

§ 388. The Triumph and its Monument.

The Senate at Rome ordered a triumph to be awarded in honor of each, Vespasian and his son Titus. They themselves, however, chose that there should be but one occasion, in which they should share jointly. The triumph was celebrated in the next year, A. D. 71. Milman thus describes the expenditure and splendor of the pageantry:

"Nothing could equal the splendor of the triumph which Vespasian shared with his son Titus for their common victories. Besides the usual display of treasures, gold, silver, jewels, purple vests, the rarest wild beasts from all quarters of the globe, there were extraordinary pageants, three or four stories high, representing to the admiration and delight of those civilized savages, all the horrors and miseries of war,—beautiful countries laid waste; armies slain, routed, led captive; cities breached by military engines, stormed, destroyed by fire and sword; women wailing; houses overturned; temples burning, and rivers of fire flowing through regions no longer cultivated or peopled, but blazing away into the long and dreary distance. Among the spoils, the golden table, the seven-branched candlestick, and the Book of the Law from the temple of Jerusalem, were conspicuous."¹⁷⁷

The triumphal procession was most impressive in its appointments. Vespasian and Titus appeared as conquerors. Each clad in the ancient purple, each crowned with laurel, each riding in his own chariot, accompanied by Domitian mounted upon his blooded steed, moved slowly along the Sacred

¹⁷⁷ *Hist. of Jews*, ii, 389.

Way, amidst the joyful acclamations of the Roman people. Before them had already passed the victorious army; the soldiers without their arms, clad in festive silk, followed by seven hundred selected and reserved captives of the war. In accordance with the ancient custom, the triumphal procession paused and waited at the temple Jupiter Capitolanus, which marked the end of the victorious march, to hear announced the death of the general of the conquered army. This distinction was awarded to Simon, son of Gioras, who commanded the Jews and Idumæans on Mount Zion in the great revolt, who, with a rope about his neck, was dragged to the place of his execution, whipped as he went along the highway in public exposure. Upon reaching the famous Tarpeian rock, he was hurled therefrom headlong to his death, and the fact was reported and announced to the conquering Romans. John of Gischala was doomed to perpetual imprisonment. And for the occasion of triumph coins were struck bearing the legend: "*Judæa capta, Judæa conquered.*"¹⁷⁸

In addition to all this, there was erected in Rome a monumental arch of Pentelic marble, constructed in most beautiful design, known now as *the Arch of Titus*. Of all the antiquities preserved in the Old World capital, this arch is unrivaled in Christian interest. After the death of Titus in A. D. 81, his brother Domitian, who succeeded him to the imperial throne, caused this monument of triumph to be erected to commemorate his victory over the Jews and the destruction of their State. It yet stands on the old street known as *Summa Sacra Via*, or the highest part of the Sacred Way, between the Forum and the Coliseum. It is that street which extends from the southern gate of Rome to the Capitol, over which the Roman conquerors were wont to move in triumphal processions, the royal captives being chained to the triumphal chariots, drawn by four horses, accompanied by the spoils of

¹⁷⁸ *Judæa capta, Judæa devicta.*

war as trophies. A translation of the inscription on the Arch of Titus reads thus :

THE SENATE
AND PEOPLE OF ROME
TO THE DEIFIED TITUS VESPANIANUS AUGUSTUS
THE SON OF
THE DEIFIED VESPANIANUS.*

This Arch of Triumph still survives the wastes and dangers of time, and its inscription tells its own story. Its moldering entablature in part represents the procession triumphal, and the sacred furniture taken from the temple of Jerusalem, as borne along over the pavement with measured step, displaying the spoils of war to the Roman peoples; the images of their gods preceding; the shew-bread, the silver trumpets which announced the year of jubilee, the seven-branched candlesticks of massive gold, the vessels of incense, and the roll of the Law. The only representation of those sacred vessels now existing, aside from the written description by Moses, is that sculptured in relief in entablature placed on the inside of this monumental arch. The Book of the Law and the veils of the Holy Place do not appear on the arch, but were deposited in the palace of the emperor; all the other articles were placed in the Temple of Peace, which was burned in the time of Commodus, who was emperor A. D. 180-192.

§ 389. Survival of the Jews. Of the Jews' survival and pertinacity of existence, Dr. Philip Schaff makes the following pointed remarks :

“ Thus, therefore, must one of the best of the Roman emperors execute the long threatened judgment of God, and the most learned Jew of his time describe it, and thereby, without willing or knowing it, [both] bear testimony to the truth of the prophecy and the Divinity of the mission of Jesus Christ, the rejection of whom brought all this and the subsequent misfortunes upon the apostate race.”¹⁷⁹ “ But the Jews still

* SENATVS POPVLYOVE. ROMANVS. DIVO. TITO. DIVI. VESPASIANI. F. VESPASIANO. AVGVSTO.

¹⁷⁹ *Hist. Christ. Church*, 1, 399.

had the Law and the Prophets and sacred traditions, to which they cling to this day with indestructible tenacity, and with the hope of a great future. Scattered over the earth, at home everywhere and nowhere; refusing to mingle their blood with any other race; dwelling in distant communities; marked as a peculiar people in every feature of the countenance, in every rite of their religion; patient, sober, and industrious; successful in every enterprise; prosperous in spite of oppression; ridiculed, and yet feared; robbed, yet wealthy; massacred, yet springing up again,—they have outlived the persecution of the centuries, and are likely to live till the end of time, the object of mingled contempt, admiration, and the wonder of the world.”¹⁸⁰

THE REVIEW.

The evidential value of our Lord’s prophecy uttered on the Mount of Olives can not be overestimated. The prediction is so circumstantially stated, and the fulfillment was in such exact agreement with the prediction, § 390. The Prediction. that some have quite insisted that the Evangelists did not record these successive events while they yet pertained to the future, but afterward, when they had become identified with the past; not prophecy, but history. Of course, no proof is offered, as it is mere conjecture. But it concedes and certifies the complete accordancy between the foretelling and the fulfilling of the prediction. Obviously, on the ground assumed, it would be impossible to verify any prophecy whatever, since the more circumstantially accordant the prophecy and the history, the more evident would be the attempted fraud! In other words, only such predictions as do not correspond with the realization could be entitled to consideration as true! Such assumptions would destroy all canon of belief, from sheer absurdities.

But the internal evidence of the case contravenes and destroys any such objections to the record of the Evangelists. For the prediction publishes certain signs of warning which are to be observed by the Christians of Judæa, with directions when and how to escape the impending horrors of the siege; viz, “When ye see Jerusalem compassed by armies, *then know*

¹⁸⁰ *Hist. Christ. Church*, 1, 402.

that her desolation is at hand. Then let them that are in Judæa flee to the mountains, and let them that are in the midst of her depart out," etc. Now if the prediction be conceived as an imposture, what possible design could the writer have entertained to insert at all the admonition given, and the direction respecting the time and manner of escape, after the event had already passed? But, on the other hand, if the Christians, and they alone, were in possession of the admonition, and conformed their conduct to the directions, then it must have been exactly because they possessed the admonition and prediction before the occurrence of the event. It was said: "Not a hair of your head shall perish." Not a single Christian suffered from the siege. And to this fact all the historical circumstances of the case correspond with extraordinary exactness. Upon every reasonable ground, therefore, the supposition which attempts to deny the reality of Christ's prediction, as such, is inadmissible.

The destruction of Jerusalem involving the destruction of the theocracy, was that which was to be accomplished in that generation. Both were to fall by the judicial judgment of God, whose occasion is designated as "the day of vengeance." And in that character it came to pass. Armies encompassed the city as foretold; banks and walls were constructed about Jerusalem, to confine the Jews within the siege; people fell by the edge of the sword by the ten thousand; the temple where the nation for centuries had gathered to observe all the rites of worship was reduced to ashes; the foundations thereof were so upturned that not one stone was left upon another; the surviving people became captives in war, but slaves in peace; and the Holy City, the joy of many generations, became literally trodden down by the Gentiles! What calamities were involved in this stupendous fulfillment of prophecy! Can conviction rest satisfied in the belief that all this cumulative suffering, and the final extinction of this great and ancient nation, were but a commonplace oc-

currence in history, having no significant relation to the providence and government of God? The complete and permanent obliteration of a whole nation from the face of the world—and that by far the most religiously-instructed people of their time, who had for centuries past regarded themselves as God's peculiar people—is an effect which all just reasoning demands that the cause and occasion should be explained. Those who reject this explanation should furnish a better one. For the whole course of history was changed by the results of that war.

Set aside, now, the several prophecies related to this occasion, who will furnish the sufficient explanation? Upon the other hand, if we accept the situation as we find it, we clearly have not far to go for the satisfactory answer. It is obvious that those most active in this war, as Titus, most familiar with its pivotal occurrences, are most clear in the discernment which attributes the whole issue to the retribution of God visited upon that apostate generation. The Jewish mind, the heathen mind, and the Christian mind have reached the same consensus. The captive Josephus, a captive in chains; the conquering general, Titus, in command of the Roman army; the Roman Julianus, an eyewitness and historian of the siege; the Christian writer, Eusebius, of a succeeding generation, in his *Chronicles*; and in modern times, the skeptical Gibbon in England, writing on the Roman Empire; and the Atheist Volney traversing Palestine in researches for materials to refute the Scriptures, all concur in seeing the movement of God's hand visible behind the dark clouds whose vengeful bolt in one day blotted a nation from the geography of the earth.

Much was meant in behalf of the Church which the Savior was founding, when he said: "When these things § 392. The Advantages. begin to come to pass, look up and lift up your heads, because your redemption draweth nigh."

Of course, the apostles of Jesus were Jewish Christians. They had been regularly admitted to the Church of the Jews

at a time when all the ancient rites of that Church were yet binding. No rule had been published, either by the authority of Christ or by the Jewish Church, prohibiting Christians from worshipping in the temple. Upon the other hand, these rites and services were powerfully enforced upon all Jews by religious instinct, by education, and by legal requirement. Hence Christ's disciples continued their services at the temple long after the death of Jesus. There was nothing incompatible with duty, or inconsistent in conduct, involved in the disciples' observing such service. For while the death of Christ was itself sacrificial as the Antitype of the whole sacrificial system, and virtually abolished the necessity of subsequent sacrificing at the temple, yet as no authoritative utterance had been made, by Christ or the Christian or Jewish Church, prohibitive of such observances to the Jewish Christians, they naturally continued the old ritual. The gospel was "to the Jew first," and associations in the same Jewish solemnities were most likely to win the Jews to the new faith of which the old observances were so illustrative. The Jewish ritual was allowable, but it was not obligatory. But in the ordering of God it was reserved for the seventeenth of July, A. D. 70, to bring in the one decisive measure, when, accordant with the prophecy of Daniel, all "sacrifice and oblation should cease;" and on the tenth of August the temple was burned,* and the theocracy was brought to an end. The point of complete and final separation between the Jews and Christians was now definitely reached. The Gentiles were not to be enslaved by the effete forms of Judaism, nor to be degraded in their freedom of spirit. There existed now no longer a common bond of unity between the old and the new Church; but in a free spirit all Christians could "lift up their heads, because the day of their redemption" had come.

* Alex. Thomson says that Jerusalem itself was captured and sacked on September 8, A. D. 69, on the Sabbath (see Sueton., p. 417, note).

On this point Dr. Schaff remarks with characteristic force and clearness :

“The awful catastrophe of the destruction of the Jewish theocracy must have produced the profoundest sensation among the Christians, of which we now, in the absence of all particular information respecting it, can hardly form a true conception. It was the greatest calamity of Judaism, and a great benefit to Christianity; a refutation of the one, a vindication and an emancipation of the other. It not only gave a mighty impulse to [the] faith, but at the same time formed a proper epoch in the history of the relation between the two religious bodies. It separated them forever. . . . God himself destroyed the house in which he had thus far dwelt; in which Jesus had taught; in which the apostles had prayed. He rejected his peculiar people for *their obstinate rejection of the Messiah*; he demolished the whole fabric of the Mosaic theocracy, whose system of worship was in its very nature associated with the temple. . . . Henceforth the heathen could no longer look upon Christianity as a mere sect of Judaism, but must regard and treat it as a new, peculiar religion [of itself]. The destruction of Jerusalem, therefore, marks that momentous crisis at which the Christian Church, as a whole, burst forever from the chrysalis of Judaism, awoke to a sense of its own maturity, and, in government and worship, at once took its independent stand before the world.” “This breaking away from the hardened Judaism and its religious forms involved no departure from the spirit of the Old Testament revelation.”¹⁸¹

“The ruin of Jerusalem was for Christianity an unequal fortune.”¹⁸² It was a change from the old Covenant to the New. It involved not the moral, but the whole ceremonial law. The change embraced services and people, conditions and admissions, Jews and Gentiles. The restriction of religion to one nation exclusively now completely ceased; the extension of privileges equally and universally to all nations was now directly asserted. The result inured greatly to the advantage of Christianity.

Bishop Westcott remarks :

“The Christians of Jerusalem had clung to their ancient law till their national hopes seemed crushed forever by the building of Ælia, and the establishment of a Gentile Church within the Holy City. At length men saw that they were already in the new age—the world to come; they saw the kingdom of heaven, as distinguished from the typical kingdom of Israel, was now set up; and it seemed that the Gospel of St. Paul

¹⁸¹ *Hist. Christ. Church*, 1, 403, 404.

¹⁸² *Réнан*.

was to be the common law of its citizens. Under the pressure of these circumstances the Judaizing party naturally made a last effort to regain their original power. It was only possible to maintain what had ceased to be national by asserting that it was universal. The discussions of the first age were thus reproduced in form, but they had a wider bearing. The struggle was not for independence, but for dominion. The Gentile Christians no longer claimed tolerance, but supremacy."¹⁸³

The same writer sets forth the removal of the distinctions between the Jew and the Gentile in the following particulars :

- a. "The admission of the Gentiles to the Christian Church. (Acts x, xi.)
- b. The freedom of the Gentile converts from the Ceremonial law. (Acts xv.)
- c. The indifference of the Ceremonial law for Jewish converts. (Gal. ii, 14-16.)
- d. The incompatibility of Judaism and Christianity."

¹⁸³ *Canon of the New Testament*, 67, 68.

CHAPTER XVIII.

PAUL'S MISSIONARY JOURNEYS TO THE GENTILE
WORLD.

- I. THE HISTORICAL GEOGRAPHY OF THE BOOK OF ACTS.
- II. PAUL'S JOURNEY TO THE GENTILE COUNTRIES.
 1. *The Apostle Visits Asiatic Cities.*
 - a) Damascus (in Syria).
 - β) Ephesus (in Asia Minor).
 2. *The Apostle Visits European Cities.*
 - a) Philippi (in Macedonia).
 - β) Thessalonica (in Macedonia).
 - γ) Athens (in Achaïa).
- III. PAUL'S JOURNEY BY SEA TO ITALY.
 - a) The Apostle's Voyage (Mediterranean Sea).
 - β) His Shipwreck at Melita (Malta).
 - γ) Puteoli, the Italian Harbor (Pozzuoli).
- IV. PAUL'S RESIDENCE AT ROME.
 - a) In Bonds in his "own hired house."
 - β) Immured in the Mamertine Prison.
 - γ) His Death at the Three Fountains.



32 The dash and period line shows the boundaries of the Roman province of Galatia, A. D. 40-68. The dotted line shows the course of the journey described 1 Acts 13, 4 to 14, 26. The red line shows the probable course of the journey described Acts 15, 2 to 18, 22.

CHAPTER XVIII.

PAUL'S MISSIONARY JOURNEYS TO THE GENTILE WORLD.

§ 393. Paul's Missionary Journeys to the Gentile World.

It is said that twelve fishermen founded Christianity. I will show you that one Frenchman can overthrow it.—VOLTAIRE.

By the beginning of the nineteenth century, Philosophy will triumph, and Christianity will fade away.—HUME.

It is the Bible, the Bible itself, which combats and triumphs most efficaciously in the war between incredulity and belief.—GUIZOT.

In the Parables of the Mustard-seed and the Leaven, Jesus depicted the small beginnings and the future extent and power of the Christian religion. What a gaze was that which thus looked far down the stream of time! The unaided faculties of no man in the situation of Jesus could have thus forecast the drama of history.—FISHER.

Christ wrought through me, for the obedience of the Gentiles, by word and deed, in the power of signs and wonders, in the power of the Holy Spirit; so that from Jerusalem, and round about even unto Illyricum, I have fully preached the gospel of Christ. So as much as in me is, I am ready to preach the gospel to you also that are at Rome.—PAUL.

Now God be praised, that, to believing souls,
Gives light in darkness, comfort in despair.—SHAKESPEARE.

ARGUMENT.

The geography of the historical part of the New Testament is full of interest to the investigator, by reason of the lands and seas traversed, the incidents occurring on the way and the circumstances under which the old civilizations, devoted to their idolatries, received the new Gospel of Christ. The Apostle of the Gentiles complies with the requirement of Jesus at his conversion: "Depart, for I will send thee far hence unto the Gentiles." He first visits the cities in Asia: Damascus in Syria, Jerusalem in Judæa, Ephesus in Asia Minor; then he introduces Christianity into Eastern Europe, establishing mission stations along the coast-line; at Philippi and Thessalonica, in Macedonia; and at Athens and Corinth, in Greece.

A prisoner, on his "appeal unto Cæsar," he is conveyed from Cæsarea-on-the-Sea to Rome under the special care of "a centurion named Julius of the Augustan band," a route which comparatively recently has been surveyed, and the whole journey in detail has been thoroughly established. The several islands, where the ship which carried the apostle touched in its course, have been fully identified; the terrific storms encountered for "fourteen days and nights" still characterize the Mediterranean Sea; the shipwreck on the island Melita (Malta), with the interesting incidents of their stay during winter; Puteoli, the southern port of Italy, where he landed; and thence on foot over the Appian Way to Rome,—are now all known to be historical. Entering the Capital a prisoner, the treatment the apostle received there, where he spent "two whole years in his own hired house, and received all that came unto him, preaching the kingdom of God, and teaching those things which concern the Lord Jesus Christ with all confidence, no man forbidding him," and his subsequent trial and death, are all matters of note in this chapter.

1. The Historical Geography of the Book of Acts.
2. Paul's Visits to the Various Gentile Countries.
3. The Apostle's Journey by Sea and Land to the Capital.
4. The Occurrences, and Close of Paul's life at Rome.

§ 394. The Historical Geography. THE following admirably condensed presentation of the Geography of the New Testament History, is taken from the *Bampton Lectures* of the distinguished Professor George Rawlinson,¹ of Exeter College, England:

"Among minute points of accordance, may be especially noticed the Geographical accuracy [of Luke].

"α) Compare the *Divisions* of Asia Minor mentioned in Acts with those of Pliny; Phrygia, Galatia, Lycaonia, Cilicia, Pamphylia, Pisidia, Asia, Mysia, Bithynia, are all recognized as existing provinces by the Roman Geographer, writing probably within a few years of Luke.²

"β) The *Divisions of European Greece* into two provinces, Macedonia and Achaïa,³ accords exactly with the arrangement of Augustus noticed in *Strabo*⁴ [the famous ancient geographer].

"γ) The various *Tracts in or about Palestine* belong to the geography of that time, and of no other. Judæa, Samaria, Galilee, Trichonitis, Ituræa, Abilene, and Decapolis are recognized as geographically distinct at this period by Jewish and classic writers.⁵

"δ) The *Routes* mentioned are such as were in use at that time.

¹ *Bamp. Lects.*, 1859, Amer. ed., pp. 402, 403.

² Pliny, *Historia Naturalis*, v, 27.

³ Acts xix, 21.

⁴ *Strabo*, xvii, ad. fin.

⁵ Pliny, *H. N.* v, 14, 18, 23; *Strab.* xvi, 2, 10, 34; *Joseph. Ant.* xix, 5, 1, etc.

'The ship of *Alexandria*' which conveyed St. Paul to Rome, lands him at Puteoli [modern Pozzuoli], follows the ordinary course of the Alexandrian corn-ships, as mentioned by Strabo,⁶ Philo,⁷ and Seneca;⁸ and touches at the customary harbors.⁹ Paul's journey from Troas by Neapolis to Philippi, presents an exact parallel to that of Ignatius sixty years later.¹⁰ His passage through Amphipolis and Apollonia on the road from Philippi to Thessalonica [modern Salonica], is in accordance with the Itinerary of Antonine,¹¹ which places those towns on the route between the two cities.

ε) "The mention of *Philippi* as 'the first city of Macedonia'¹² to one approaching from the east, is entirely correct, since there was no other between it and Neapolis. The statement that it was 'a colony' is also true."¹³

§ 395. The Cities of Asia.

a) DAMASCUS (SYRIA).

"Neither went I up to Jerusalem to them which were apostles before me; but I went away into Arabia; and again I returned unto Damascus."¹⁴ "In Damascus the governor under Aretas the king guarded the city of the Damascenes in order to take me; and through a window I was let down in a basket by the wall, and escaped his hands."¹⁵

This Aretas was king of Arabia, whose capital was Petra. Herod Antipas married his daughter; then repudiated her, and married Herodias, the wife of Herod Philip [I] while her husband was still living, for which John Baptist sternly reprobated Antipas, while Aretas made war upon him and destroyed Herod's army. Thereupon Herod appealed to Emperor Tiberius for counsel and help; and Tiberius ordered Vitellius, then president of Syria, to capture Aretas dead or alive, and send him to Rome in chains, or send him his head.¹⁶ But before this order could be executed, Tiberus died, on March 12th, A. D. 37, and the news of his death reached Vitellius at Jerusalem while on the march with his army to take Aretas. Vitellius now regarded the order as nugatory, and its requirement as extinguished; whereupon he returned to Antioch in Syria. Vitellius is said to have entertained an old grudge against

⁶ *Ant.* xviii, 6, 3. ⁷ In *Flacc.* 968, 969. ⁸ *Epis.* 77. ⁹ Suetonius, *Titus*, c. 5.

¹⁰ *Martyr. Ignat.* c. 5.

¹¹ *Ib.* c. 2.

¹² Acts xvi, 12.

¹³ Dion Cassius, *Hist. of Rome*, li, 4; Pliny's *H. N.* iv, 11; *Strabo*, vii, 41.

¹⁴ Gal. i, 17.

¹⁵ See Alford's Comm. on 2 Cor. xi, 32, 33; comp. Acts ix, 22-25.

¹⁶ Josephus, *Ant.* xviii, 5, 1-3.

Herod Antipas.¹⁷ Upon the death of Tiberius, Caius Caligula immediately succeeded to the imperial throne at Rome.

Some considerable embarrassment has been experienced by some writers in placing this King Aretas in power over Damascus just at the time that Paul effected his escape from the governor of the city; and others have not hesitated to pronounce the statement of Paul as unhistorical. But absolute proof to the contrary exists in coins struck by this king;¹⁸ and what renders the case the more extraordinary is the fact that *after* the accession of Nero and several of his successors, coins again exist. Now Damascus had previously belonged to a predecessor of this Aretas; and there is strong probability that when Caligula deposed and banished Herod Antipas, giving his realm to Herod Agrippa, he also gave Damascus to Aretas. Caligula made a number of changes in the year 38, "granting Ituræa to Soemus, Less Armenia, and parts of Arabia, the territory of Cotys to Rhæmetalces,¹⁹ etc. Conybeare and Howson state that

"The Nabathæan Arabs, after the Babylonian captivity, grew into a civilized nation, built a great mercantile city at Petra, and were ruled by a line of kings which bore the title of 'Aretas.' The Aretas dynasty ceased in the second century, when Arabia Petræa became a Roman province under Trajan."²⁰

Josephus mentions that the Damascenes had many years before invited an earlier Aretas to rule over them; that Agrippa I, the favorite at court, became interested in their behalf; that indeed he received a bribe from them to advocate their claims before Flaccus, prefect of Syria.²¹ Eckhel then remarks:

"It is therefore not unlikely that, in A. D. 38, the Damascenes, through the influence of Agrippa at the imperial court, may, at his own request, have been transferred from the province of Syria to the kingdom of Petra. The coins of Aretas (II), with the inscription 'Lover-of-

¹⁷ Josephus, *Ant.* xviii, 4, 5.

¹⁸ See Lewin's *Paul*, 1, 67, 68; comp. Conybeare and Howson's *Paul*, 1, 99, n. 4; McClintock and Strong's *Cycl.* 1, 385, in which is one coin of Nero exactly answering to this date, A. D. 37; *Smith's Bible Dict.* 1, 152.

¹⁹ *Smith's Bible Dict.* 1, 152.

²⁰ *Life and Epist. of Paul*, 1, 99, n. 4.

²¹ *Ant.* xviii, 6, 3.

Greeks,' with whom he wished to ingratiate himself, may have been struck on this occasion. It is not a little remarkable that coins of Damascus have been found with the heads of Augustus and Tiberius;²² but none with the head of Caligula or Claudius;²³ but in the time of Nero²⁴ the head of the emperor again appears. The inference is that Damascus during the reign of Augustus and Tiberius was annexed to Syria, but that in the time of Caligula it was severed from it until the reign of Nero. This would satisfactorily explain how Damascus came to have an ethnarch or Jewish ruler under Aretas in A. D. 39."²⁵

"Weiseler, in his article on *Aretas*, refers to Mionnet as his authority for the existence of a coin of Aretas which bears the date of 101 [A. D.] Now, if this date refers to the Pompeian era, the coin would belong to A. D. 37-38, about the time in which Saul's mission to Damascus took place."²⁶

Here is evidence drawn from biographical, historical, and numismatic sources, all of which concur in confirming the statements of Paul and Luke respecting Aretas being in power as King of Damascus, whose subordinate—a Jewish governor—sought to seize upon the person of the apostle when he escaped by a basket let down over the wall. Now over against this evidence there is absolutely no historical warrant whatever to render a contrary conclusion reasonable. Apart from the confirmation, the statement of Paul and Luke are entitled to the consideration given to profane writers of history under similar circumstances; and he who challenges is bound to refute the sacred writers by historical facts, and not make merest assertions or assumptions.

β) EPHEBUS (ASIA MINOR).

"And when the town clerk [temple-keeper] had quieted the multitude, he saith: Ye men of Ephesus, what man is there who knoweth not how that the city of the Ephesians is temple-keeper of the great Diana, and of the image which fell down from Jupiter?"²⁷

The citizens of Ephesus, in whose keeping the temple was, charged the *Neokóros* with the duty of adorning this sanctuary of Diana, especially on the occasions of the public games. This temple was known as one of the *Seven Wonders of the*

²² A. D. 1-37. ²³ A. D. 37-54. ²⁴ A. D. 54-68. ²⁵ *Eckhel*, iii, 331.

²⁶ *Farrar's Life and Work of Paul*, Vol I; *Excursus*, viii and ix.

²⁷ Acts xix, 35.

World, and the sacred games observed at Ephesus were especially famous. There are several coins extant which bear the veritable words used by Luke in reference to this particular occasion. Some of these coins add "Diana." The term *Neokóros*, variously rendered in English,* occurs in the New Testament but once, and this one use serves to illustrate the minute accuracy of the sacred historian, even in this incidental matter, in giving this officer his proper designation.

Alford says: "He was the keeper of the archives, and public reader of the decrees in the assemblies."²⁸ Thomas Lewin says: "He was in fact, during the year he was in office, the representative of the civil power, and was president and speaker of the Senate and Assembly. This will account for the tone of authority which was assumed by him on the riot of Demetrius."²⁹ Conybeare and Howson say: "The games of Asia and Ephesus were pre-eminently famous; and those who held the office of president of the games were men of high distinction and extensive influence. When robed in mantles of purple and crowned with garlands, they assumed the duty of regulating the gymnastic contests, and controlling the tumultuary crowd in the theater, they might literally be called the 'Chief of Asia.'"³⁰

§396. The Cities of Europe.

a) PHILIPPI (MACEDONIA).

"And on the Sabbath day we went forth without the gate by the river-side, where we supposed there was a place of prayer; and we sat down and spake unto the women who had come together."³¹

The question to be asked and answered in reference to the Scripture cited is: What is the meaning of Paul's going forth out of the city of Philippi on the Sabbath-day to a place of prayer, in order to find a congregation of hearers? The ancient Jews entertained the sentiment that the seashore or river-side was the purest possible place of an open country for the worship of the pure and true God. The answer to the question is best furnished by Jewish and other authorities.

* *Νεωκόρος* is rendered "Recorder" by Lewin; "Clean-sweeper" by Green, but denied by Suidas; "adorner" by Alford and Biscoe; "temple-keeper" by Rev. Version; while Thayer's Greek-English Lex. of the New Testament defines the term: "1. A temple-cleaner; 2. One in charge of, and adorer of the temple; 3. A worshiper of a deity."

²⁸ *In loco*.

²⁹ *Life and Epis. of Paul*, 1, 315, 316.

³⁰ *Life and Epis. of Paul*, 11, 96.

³¹ Acts xv1, 13.

Josephus says: "Moses . . . thought himself obliged to follow the custom of his forefathers, and offered his prayers in the open air."³² He mentions his own friends at Tiberias, who "on the next day all came into the *proseucha* [*i. e.*, place of prayer]; it was a large edifice, and capable of receiving a great number of people."³³ He also cites the decree of the city Halicarnassus:

"We have decreed that as many men and women of the Jews as are willing so to do, may celebrate their Sabbaths, and perform their holy offices, according to the Jewish laws; and may make their *proseuchæ* at the seaside, according to the custom of their forefathers."³⁴

Philo, the celebrated contemporary of Josephus, mentions a custom of the Alexandrian Jews in Egypt, who

"Early in the morning go out of the gates of the city in crowds; that they go to the shores near by, and, standing in a very pure place, they raise their voices together³⁵ [in worship]." "But there are many places of prayer, according to each section of the city."³⁶

Juvenal refers to the Jews at Rome having a place outside the gate Capena, where a fountain was, and plenty of water. This was a convenience, for the Jews were accustomed to wash their hands before prayers. Tertullian, the Carthaginian, says:

"By resorting to these customs you deliberately deviate from your religious rites to those of strangers. For the Jewish feasts are the Sabbath, . . . and the fasts of unleavened bread, and prayers at the seaside."³⁷ And after the temple was burned, and people dispersed, "by every seaside"³⁸ or river-side.

Proseucha means prayer; and then by usage acquired the secondary sense of a *place* for prayer. Where no synagogues existed it became the place for assemblies, whether it was a building, an oratory, a chapel, or neither, but out under the open sky. *Proseuchæ* were usually placed outside of towns or

³² *Josephus contra, Ap.* 1, lib. ii, 2.

³³ *Life of Josephus*, 54.

³⁴ *Ant.* xiv, 10, 23.

³⁵ *In Flacc.* 983, D.

³⁶ Ἐὐν προσευχῶν πολλὰ δὲ εἰσὶ καθ' ἕκαστον τμήμα τῆς πόλεως, *in Flacc.* 1011.

³⁷ *Orationes littorales; Ad Nationes*, i, xiii.

³⁸ *Per omne litus (Ante-Nic. Fathers, Vol. III, p. 123, n. 7, citing de Jejuniis xvi.*

cities, as the laws and administrators would not allow them to be placed within the walls, especially in the Roman cities and colonies. Often they were located in the open air, or in a grove, or amidst shrubbery, or under a tree; yet always near the water, for the purpose of ablutions, which preceded Jewish devotions, as with the Moslem of to-day. The *proseucha* seems to have existed prior to the synagogue. In Alexandria the *proseucha* was a synagogue, but not so in Judæa. Philippi was a colony. No great number of Jews lived there; and the persecution of Paul and Silas at Philippi was due to the Gentiles and not to the Jews; for the city was a military garrison, a colony of soldiers, and was poorly adapted to trade. The *proseucha* was outside the city, for the reason that the authorities would not permit a service so at variance to heathen worship, to be near heathen temples. Thomas Lewin says:

“These *proseuchæ* were commonly in the open air and uncovered, being spacious areas, like *fora* or market-places. The Jewish ceremonial law was accompanied with frequent ablutions; and the public worship was generally conducted for convenience in the immediate vicinity of water; and Luke places the oratory in question without the city by the side of the river. . . . It would seem that this river was not immediately under the walls of the city, but at some little distance. Now, Philippi is surrounded by numerous little springs; whence its old name ‘*Krenides*’;³⁹ but there is only one river⁴⁰ in the vicinity, . . . the *Ganges* or *Gangites*, and is now known as *Bournabachi*. . . . As Paul’s invariable practice was to make the first appeal to his own countrymen, the missionaries on the Sabbath-day attended divine services at the ordinary [*proseucha*], for the purpose of preaching the new doctrine.”⁴¹

Thus again the custom of Paul in his missionary itinerary as recorded by Luke, and incidentally introduced in the narration, finds ample confirmation in both ancient and modern authorities respecting the Jewish usage of worship of that period in heathen lands. No author of equal antiquity, feigning historical claims, would think to adventure into such minute particularizations of description for fear of tripping. It is precisely this incidental mention of minute details, uncon-

³⁹ Κρηνίδες.

⁴⁰ Ποταμός.

⁴¹ *Life and Epis. of St. Paul*, i, 212, 213.

sciously inserted, found to be in accordance with other historical statements, which carries the conviction that the writer was writing the truth on the spot, and relates circumstances understandingly as he saw them. And the conviction is irresistible. The historian, writing under such circumstances, enables the reader to see the facts mentioned through the eyes of the writer.

β) THESSALONICA (MACEDONIA).

“And when they found them not [Paul and Silas], they dragged Jason and certain brethren before the rulers of the city, crying: These who have turned the world upside down are come hither also; whom Jason hath received; and these all act contrary to the decrees of Cæsar, saying there is another king called Jesus. And they troubled the multitude and the rulers of the city, when they heard these things.”⁴²

The term used by Luke for “the rulers” is “*the politarchs.*”⁴³ It occurs twice in this one citation, but nowhere else in the New Testament. The Evangelist employs the word with remarkable intelligence and discrimination. Etymologically, the title means the “rulers or prefects of a city.” That which lends interest to its use here is, that the term which Luke uses with his characteristic accuracy is found in no other ancient writing. On this account, some have doubted whether the sacred writer was correct in employing that particular word to convey the function of the city magistrates of Thessalonica. “But wisdom is justified of her children.” Across the great Roman road known as the *Egnatian Way*, which divides the city in two parts, a Triumphal Arch has recently been discovered which was dedicated to the victory won by Augustus and Antony over Brutus and Cassius at Philippi. This highway runs east and west through Thessalonica, and this monument stands near the west end. Its inscription is in Greek letters written on marble, and states that *the magistracy of Thessalonica was vested in seven men called POLITARCHS.* Professor Salmon says:

“At Thessalonica the magistrates [in the plural] are called Politarchs. Now this name is found in connection with Thessalonica in no

⁴²Acts xvii, 6-8.

⁴³Τὸς πολιάρχας.

ancient author; but the arch which to this day spans the main street bears the inscription that it had been raised by the seven *politarchs*.”*

It is something to be remarked that, out of the seven names mentioned in the inscription on the arch as *politarchs*, six are named in the *New Testament* as *Christians*, and at least three were *Paul's personal friends* belonging to this particular country. These names are *Secundus* of *Thessalonica*,⁴⁴ *Sopater* of *Berea*,⁴⁵ and *Gaius* of *Macedonia*.⁴⁶

It is the judicious remark of *Thomas Lewin*:

“We have here again an instance of the extreme accuracy of *Luke* in describing the magistrates of *Thessalonica* by a title not given to them in books, from which an impostor might have gathered the fact, but found only in ancient monuments accidentally brought to light in comparatively modern times.”⁴⁷

Conybeare and *Howson* remark:

“It is at least well worth while to notice, as a mere matter of *Christian evidence*, how accurately *St. Luke* writes concerning the political characteristics of the cities and provinces which he mentions. He takes notice in the most artless and incidental manner of minute details which a fraudulent composer would judiciously avoid, and which, in the mythical result of a mere oral tradition, would surely be loose and inexact. *Cyprus* is a *proconsular province*.⁴⁸ *Philippi* is ‘a colony.’ The magistrates of *Thessalonica* have an unusual title unmentioned in ancient literature; but it appears, from a monument of a different kind, that the title is perfectly correct. And the whole aspect of what happened at *Thessalonica*, as compared with events at *Philippi*, is in perfect harmony with the ascertained difference in the political condition of the two places. There is no mention of the rights and privileges of the *Roman citizen*; but we are presented with a mixed mob of *Greeks* and *Jews* who are anxious to show themselves to be ‘*Cæsar's friends*.’”⁴⁹ “And these magistrates, by whom the question at issue is ultimately decided, are not *Roman prætors*, but *Greek politarchs*.”⁵⁰

**Bampton Lects.* 1881, 5th ed. p. 322. This arch consists of marble masonry in blocks six feet thick, making a span of twelve feet and eighteen feet high. The inscription reads: ΠΟΛΕΙΤΑΡΧΟΥΝΤΩΝ ΣΩΣΙΠΑΤΡΟΥ ΤΟΥ ΚΛΕΟ ΠΑΤΡΑΣ ΚΑΙ ΛΟΥΚΙΟΥ ΠΟΝΤΙΟΥ ΣΕΚΟΥΝΔΟΥ ΠΟΥΒΛΙΟΥ ΦΛΑΟΥΤΙΟΥ ΣΑΒΕΙΝΟΥ ΔΗΜΗΤΡΙΟΥ ΤΟΥ ΦΑΤΣΤΟΥ ΔΗΜΗΤΡΙΟΥ ΤΟΥ ΝΙΚΟΠΟΛΕΩΣ ΖΩΛΙΟΥ ΤΟΥ ΠΑΡΜΕΝΙΩΝΟΣ ΤΟΥ ΚΑΙ ΜΕΝΙΣΚΟΥ ΓΑΙΟΥ ΑΓΓΙΑΛΗΙΟΥ ΠΟΤΕΙΤΟΥ. (See *Conybeare* and *Howson's Paul*, vol. 1, p. 395.)

⁴⁴*Acts* xx, 4.

⁴⁵*Ib.* xx, 4.

⁴⁶*Ib.* xix, 29.

⁴⁷*Life and Epis. of Paul*, i, 232, n. 118, and p. 226.

⁴⁸*Acts* xiii, 7.

⁴⁹*Comp.* *John* xix, 12.

⁵⁰*Life and Epis. of Paul*, i, 396.

This minute exactness with which the Evangelist Luke—traveling through strange countries where different languages are spoken and different customs of the people prevail under different governments, making mention of different communities in different lands and different officers in different cities and nations, recording titles not to be found in books, yet since proved conclusively to be correct—is something wonderful as an attestation of the writer's superior intelligence and reliability. Some of these terms and designations have been questioned or denied as being true; others were unknown to history, and therefore doubted; but every one, once questioned, has since been strictly verified as historical. Thus a "proconsul" presided at Cyprus; a "chiliarch"⁵¹ commanded soldiers at Jerusalem; the "asiarchs"⁵² ruled at Ephesus; the "prætors" and "lictors" are found in Roman Philippi;⁵³ and "politarchs"⁵⁴ are in authority in Greek Thessalonica.

γ) ATHENS (ΑΘΑΙΑ).

"Now while Paul waited for them at Athens, his spirit was provoked within him as he beheld the city full of idols. And Paul said: Ye men of Athens, in all things I perceive that ye are very religious.* For as I passed along and observed the objects of your worship, I found an altar with this inscription: To THE UNKNOWN GOD."⁵⁵

The special point to be determined is, whether an altar bearing such inscription as is here affirmed was existent as an altar of devotion in Athens at the time mentioned. Some opinions have doubted the historical worth of Paul's statement and Luke's record. What proof, if any, does history furnish in conformity with the apostle's observation, incidentally mentioned by him in his address on the hill Areopagus, in this classic city?

First. It is to be carefully observed that the Greeks were conspicuous as being an extremely religious people, and the

* Δεισιδαιμονεστέρους.

⁵¹ Χιλιάρχος, commander of a thousand, Acts xxi, 31.

⁵² Ασάρχης, the officer of provincial "Asia," in charge of festivals and games. Acts xix, 31. ⁵³Id. xvi, 35. ⁵⁴Id. xvii, 6, 8. ⁵⁵Id. xvii, 16, 22, 23.

Athenians were the most devoted of the Greeks. Josephus, the contemporary of Paul, explicitly affirms that the Athenians were "the most religious of the Greeks."⁵⁶ Now, at this period, the Romans pursued the policy of suppressing Judaism and Christianity as one, because the object of worship was not authorized by the State; but, upon the contrary, the Athenians, being of more liberal sentiment, received by public authority* the deities of foreign nations, and even erected altars to those who were to them unknown. Jerome⁵⁷ mentions that at Athens an altar was dedicated to the gods of Europe, Asia, and Africa; that is, the gods of the world at large were comprehensively included, whether known or unknown. To the testimony of Jerome is to be added that of the geographer Strabo, who says that "the Athenians, as they were accustomed to take other things from foreigners, so also the gods; for from strangers they received many rites, even to such an extent as to be made the subject of comedy."⁵⁸ Pausanias,⁵⁹ an antiquarian traveler who visited Athens from fifty to a hundred years after the apostle, makes mention of temples erected to the gods, extending along the highway for five miles from the harbor Peræus to the Acropolis of the city, and he remarks that, while all Greece was notable for devotion to religion, more gods existed in Athens than in all the remaining country. G. S. Davies, A. M., in his work entitled *Paul in Greece*, says:

"We learn from Pliny that, at the time of Nero, Athens contained over three thousand statues, besides a countless number of less images within the walls of private houses. If there were the least reason to suspect Pliny of exaggeration, Pausanias's subsequent description would assist us to realize its veracity. In one street, well known to the readers of history for its connection with one of the strangest episodes in Athenian politics, there stood before every house a square pillar carrying upon it a bust of the god Hermes, whence the street bore

* It was death for any private person to disturb the religion of the State by the introduction of a foreign god that had not been recognized. (Lewin, *Life and Epis. of Paul*, i, 260.)

⁵⁶Τούς εὐσεβέστατους τῶν Ἑλλήνων, *Contra Ap.* 11, 12.

⁵⁷*Comm. Tit.* 1, 12.

⁵⁸*Lib.* x, 471.

⁵⁹*Pausan.* xxiv, c.

the name of 'the street Hermes.' Another street of the Tripods was lined with tripods dedicated by winners in Greek national games, and carrying each one an inscription of a deity."⁶⁰

In short, so numerous were the niches for the statues of the gods in this classic and elegant city, that in every grove and garden, on every street and avenue, at every gate and angle of the highway, at every porch and purlieu, was a sculptured form of a deity to address the eye, or a sanctuary for devotions to a god. Everywhere was one in the presence of a divinity; so that the stricture of a Roman satirist was hardly an exaggeration, that "in Athens it was easier to find a god than a man."⁶¹ Even the Acropolis, the eminence of great height, which was the earliest seat of Athens, whose summit embraces about two acres, was adorned with marble temples of a magnificent order and finish—the crowning glory of Athens—parts of which temples remain to this day, evidencing the greatest skill of the mightiest masters of art, verifying the figurative saying attributed to Xenophon that "The Acropolis was one altar, sacrifice, and votive offering to the gods, and that they were obliged to keep such a number of feasts as did no other city of the Greeks."⁶² Dionysius Hali-carnassensis declares that, "If any praise belonged to the city of the Athenians, it was chiefly that in all things, and at all times, they followed the gods, and did nothing without their direction."⁶³ These facts are in strict accordance with the statement that there did exist at Athens an altar dedicated "To the Unknown God."

Secondly. "We are not left to conjecture, however, as to the specific fact of such an altar as that referred to by the apostle, which commanded the devotions of the Athenians. Apollonius says that, at Athens, altars of the unknown gods were built;⁶⁴ and other pagan writers mention those dedicated

⁶⁰ Pp. 140, 141. ⁶¹ *Petron. Sat.* 17; cf. *Livy*, xiv, 29. ⁶² *De Repub. Ath.* 699, B.

⁶³ *Thucyd. Hist.* § 4, med.

⁶⁴ Ἀθηναίων οὐ καὶ ἀγνώστων δαίμωνων βωμοὶ ἱδρυνταί, *Philos. de Vit. Apoll.* vi, 3.

to unknown divinities,⁶⁵ wherein the use of the plural number by no means necessitates the conclusion that there was none in the singular as well as in the plural. It is fairly inferable that each altar bore the inscription, 'To the Unknown God.' Winer so understands the application of these words, and Dr. Plumptre seems so to regard this as the intended meaning, comparing the celebrated inscription on the veil of Isis and a Mithraic inscription on an altar at Ostia, 'The Sign of the Undiscovered Deity.'"⁶⁶

The Greeks represented their own gods invariably in statuary, of whose origin, character, and history they had their own accounts. Accordingly, it was difficult for them to conceive that there could be a Divine Being who was at once "the eternal, immortal, *invisible*, the only wise God." If, withal, they knew not even his name, they must hold in reverential regard One whom others cognized as "The Unknown God." Such was the Hebrews' God. To pronounce the Ineffable Name Jehovah⁶⁷ belonged alone to the high priest, which he could pronounce only on the great day of Atonement, when he stood in the Holy of Holies, sprinkling the mercy-seat with blood, to atone for the sins of the people. By reason of the Name being incommunicable, the proper pronunciation of it at length was lost, and became "unknown." That the Athenian altar referred directly to the true God, is obvious in that the apostle identified him as such when he said: "Whom therefore ye ignorantly worship, him declare I unto you." The Greek historian of the Romans, Dion Cassius, designates as the Divine Being that which "may not be expressed." In reply to Philo and his Jewish companions, Caius Caligula replied: "Ye are god-haters who esteem not me to be a god, but Him that may not be named by you."⁶⁸ Lucan and also Trebellius Pollio mention Him as "an undiscovered

⁶⁵ Ἀγνώστων δαιμόνων, *Diog. Laërt.* 1, x, 110, etc.

⁶⁶ Farrar's *Life and Work of Paul*, 1, 531, n. 4.

⁶⁷ יהוה

⁶⁸ Ἀλλὰ τὸν ἀκατονώμαστον ὑμῖν, *Philo, Leg. ad Caium*, § 44, p. 1041, A. B.

[uncertain] God;”⁶⁹ and Justin Martyr refers to God as the “All-Hidden”⁷⁰ in the sense of the invisible, unrevealed. But in the second century, Lucian, in his work called *Philopatris*, written in opposition to Christianity, represents a Christian as saying: “We have found the Unknown God at Athens, and worshiped him with hands outstretched towards heaven; and we give thanks to him as being thought worthy to be the subjects of his power;”⁷¹ and this writer in another place, employs this formula of an oath: “I swear by the Unknown God at Athens.”⁷²

Thirdly. As already intimated, Paul distinctly claims the “Unknown God” of the Athenian altar as identical with the Hebrew Jehovah, whom the apostle proceeds to make known: “Whom therefore ye ignorantly worship, Him declare I unto you.” The Jehovah of the Old Testament, is the Jesus of the New. The Athenians conceived the existence of the invisible God, but confessed ignorance of his character and relation to them as his worshipers. This fact at least is secure; but how could the idea of such a deity have been imported into Athens?

When Alexander the Great made his extended campaign against the Persians, he passed through Palestine (about B. C. 333); and as he approached Jerusalem he was met by a multitude of the Jews. The mighty conqueror stood in utter amazement when he beheld the high priest⁷³ at the front of the people, robed in purple and scarlet cloth, bearing upon a golden plate on the forefront of his miter the inscription of the incommunicable Name written in four Hebrew letters,⁷⁴ which in reverence none but the high priest could ever pronounce, and he only when alone in the Holy of Holies once

⁶⁹ “Incertus Deus,” *Pharsalia*, ii, 592.

⁷⁰ πάγκρυφος, *Paræ ad Graec.* § 38.

⁷¹ Ἡμεῖς δὲ τὸν ἐν Ἀθηναῖς ἀγνωστον φεύροντες, etc., *Philopat.* xxix, 180.

⁷² Νῆ τὸν ἀγνωστον ἐν Ἀθηναῖς, *Philopat.* xiii, 769.

⁷³ That is, the high priest Jaddua (Ἰαδδοῦς) B. C. 332; Josephus, *Ant.* xi, 8, 3-6.

⁷⁴ יהוה—*Jehovah*, or probably pronounced “*Yahveh*.”

a year. Further, Josephus relates that, upon discovering this Name, Alexander "approached by himself, and adored that Name," declaring that at Deos in Macedonia he had had a vision, in which he saw this identical man as high priest, in these robes, and bearing this miter with this inscrutable Name, who urged Alexander to push on his campaign, for he would


"Conquer Darius, and destroy the power of the Persians;" that he then "went up into the temple and offered sacrifice to God, according to the high priest's directions, and magnificently treated both the high priest, and the [other] priests. And when the Book of Daniel was shown him, wherein Daniel declared that one of the Greeks should destroy the empire of the Persians, he supposed that himself was the person intended." Moreover, "he said to the multitude that if any of them should enlist in his army, they should continue to live according to the laws of their forefathers, . . . and many were ready to accompany him in his wars."⁷⁵

Now, since the spread of the Greek language throughout the East is attributed to this conqueror and campaign, with so many Jews mixed with his soldiery in making his conquests, it is rational to suppose that, upon his return to Greece, Alexander and his army brought with them a knowledge of the Supreme Being whose prophet had predicted Alexander's successes, especially as Alexander himself had had a vision apart from the prediction of Daniel respecting him, all of which had been verified now in history to the very letter. Nevertheless, as respected the relation, the character, and claim of this inscrutable Deity, he must have remained to the religious Athenians essentially "The Unknown God." About a half-century afterwards, the Jewish Scriptures were translated into the Greek Septuagint, and were published abroad as that language became the language of common intercourse between the nations.⁷⁶

Thomas Lewin observes:

"Since the conquest of Alexander the Great an intimacy subsisted between the Jews and Greeks, and in particular the Athenians had en-

⁷⁵ *Ant.* xi, 8, 5; *comp.* *Dan.* vii, 6; viii, 8-8, 20-22; xi, 3. ⁷⁶ About 280 B. C.



22 The dash and period line shows the boundaries of the Roman province of Galatia, A. D. 40-63. The probable course of the journey described Acts 13, 23 to 21, 17 is shown thus
 The Voyage to Rome Acts 27 and 28, thus

PAUL'S Third Missionary Journey, and the Voyage to Italy.

* Great Syrtis Sandbank of Africa. (Acts xviii, 16, 17).

tered into a treaty with that singular people, and had greatly honored Hyrcanus the high priest; and it is scarcely credible that the Athenians who adopted the gods of all foreigners, should have excluded Jehovah, whose mighty acts could not but be familiar to the neighboring nations."⁷⁷

Nor is there any evidence of such exclusion.

Here is a combination of circumstances extraordinary indeed, and without a parallel in history. The repeated reference to the Athenian altar bearing such an inscription—an altar with reference to which oaths were solemnized; the different forms of expression used by different heathens, especially by Roman pagans of eminence; such as emperor, historian, and adversary to Christianity, as well as by Christians, to convey the thought of "The Unknown" but not unknowable God—are the things which justify the belief in the historical existence of the Athenian altar and inscription referred to by the Apostle Paul, and recorded by Luke. As to the identity of that God with the nameless one seen by Alexander in his vision at Deos, and afterward on the high priest's miter near Jerusalem, known as the incommunicable Name, and Alexander's return to Greece with his army in close contact with so many Jews, these facts furnish a reasonable and sufficient ground for the Athenians to erect for themselves an altar with the inscription, "To the Unknown God."⁷⁸

§ 397. Paul's Voyage to Rome (Mediterranean Sea).

I.

"And when it was determined that we should sail for Italy, they delivered Paul and certain other prisoners to a centurion named Julius, of the Augustan band.⁷⁹ And embarking on a ship of Adramyttium which was about to sail unto the places on the coast of Asia, we put to sea."⁸⁰

Whether Julius and his cohort were citizen soldiers of Cæsa-rea, a city of Judæa, built in honor of Augustus Cæsar, or be-

⁷⁷ *Life and Epis. of Paul*, 1, 263, 264.

⁷⁸ See Lewin, *Life and Epis. of St. Paul*, 1, 263, 264.

⁷⁹ Σπελρης Σεβαστης *Augustan cohort*, from the city Sebaste; both city and cohort so named in honor of Augustus, the first and honored emperor of the Romans.

⁸⁰ Acts xxvii, 2.

longed to that band at Rome which was attached to the person of the emperor, is possibly now indeterminate, and certainly is irrelevant to this discussion. There are opinions favoring each proposition among learned men. There is conclusive proof that in both countries there were bodies of soldiers bearing the designation. Alford thinks that Julius had been sent from Rome to Asia on some service, and was now returning when Paul, with other prisoners, was placed in his charge. Josephus says that, "the Syrians, . . . valuing themselves highly on this account, that the greatest part of the Roman soldiers that were there [*i. e.* at Cæsarea] were either of Cæsarea or Sebaste."⁸¹

Tacitus says:

"At this time also was first enrolled the body of Roman knights entitled *Augustani*; men in the prime of life and remarkable for their bodily vigor. Some were naturally licentious, others with the prospects of promotion. They are occupied by day and night in applauding the prince [the emperor] as loudly as they could, applying to him and his voice terms appropriate to the gods, and lived in honor and renown, as though they were preferred for their virtues."⁸²

II.

But the main predicates in the Scripture cited may be formulated thus: that prisoners were not unfrequently sent to Rome for judgment; that often they were sent to the capital in chains; that those from this region were sent to Italy by sea; and that the apostle was thus sent upon his appeal unto Cæsar.

It is interesting to know in the outset that every important detail of the apostle's voyage, as reported in Acts, has been questioned and even condemned in advance of any proper investigation. It is even more interesting to know that the whole history of Paul's journey thither has been traversed critically anew; and after the most critical examination possible, every particular narrated by Luke has been

⁸¹ Josephus mentions that "Cumanus took one troop of horsemen out of Cæsarea called the troop of Sebaste." *Wars*, ii, 12, 5.

⁸² *Annals*, xiv, 15; comp. Sueton. on *Nero*, c. 20, close.

completely verified. The nautical terms used by Luke have been declared incorrect; the ports mentioned have been unreal; the Island of Melita (Malta), the scene of Paul's shipwreck, has been called a myth; the existence of serpents on the island has been absolutely denied; and the geography and hydrography of the route have been more than doubted; while maps and charts have been reconstructed accordant with these preconceived notions.

As intimated, a comparatively recent survey, conducted upon strictly scientific principles of modern navigation, has been made, which not only destroys these false assumptions, but substantiates beyond recall the record by Luke of Paul's voyage. A thorough search has been made into the local and historical facts, independently of traditions, relating to the harbors touched in the route, and verifications found and recorded, which leaves nothing more to be desired. The results have been given to the world, published in London, entitled *The Voyage and Shipwreck of St. Paul*,⁸³ in which both processes and conclusions are given. One or two citations must suffice:

"Since the second edition was printed, the completion of the Admiralty survey of the South Coast of Crete, and the publication of sailing directions for the Island of Crete by Captain Spratt, R. N., and the travels and researches in Crete by the same author, leave nothing to be desired for the geographical details of this part of the voyage. We have now all four localities mentioned; viz., *Fair Havens, Clauda, Lasea, and Port Phenice*, each of them agreeing most minutely with the narratives, and still retaining the names given them by St. Luke."⁸⁴

"Although we can scarcely have a stronger case of traditional evidence than the present, in the following inquiry I attach no weight to it whatever. I do not even assume the authenticity of the narrative of the voyage and shipwreck contained in Acts of the Apostles, but scrutinize St. Luke's account of the voyage, precisely as I would do those of Baffin or Middleton, or of any ancient voyage of doubtful authority, or involving points on which controversies have been raised. A searching comparison of the narrative with the localities where the events so circumstantially related are said to have taken place, with the aids which recent advances in our knowledge of the geography and the navigation of the eastern part of the Mediterranean supply, accounts for

⁸³ By James Smith, F. R. S., etc., 3d ed. 1866.

⁸⁴ "*Voyage and Shipwreck*," Preface, 3d ed, p. 1.

every transaction, clears up every difficulty, and exhibits an agreement so perfect in all its parts as to admit of but one explanation, namely, THAT IT IS A NARRATION OF REAL EVENTS, WRITTEN BY ONE PERSONALLY ENGAGED IN THEM, AND THAT THE TRADITION RESPECTING THE LOCALITY IS TRUE."⁸⁵

It is a common practice of the period for the authorities to send prisoners from this region to Rome, to account to the emperor for their conduct. Josephus says that Quadratus, president of Syria,

"Sent away Ananus the high priest, and Ananus the commander [of the Temple], in bonds to Rome, to give an account of what they had done to Claudius Cæsar. He also ordered the principal men, both of the Samaritans and of the Jews, as also Cumanus the procurator, and Celer the tribune, to go to Italy to the emperor that he might hear their cause and determine their differences."⁸⁶ "Then Varus did forgive the multitude their offenses, but sent their captain to Cæsar to be examined by him."⁸⁷ "Felix took Eleazar, the arch robber, and many of them that were with him alive, when they had ravaged the country for twenty years together, and sent them to Rome."⁸⁸ "When Felix was procurator of Judæa, there were certain priests of my acquaintance, and very excellent persons they were, whom, on small and trifling occasions, he had put into bonds and sent them to Rome to plead their cause before Cæsar."⁸⁹ "Vitellius sent Marcellus, a friend of his, to take care of the affairs of Judæa, and ordered Pilate to go to Rome to answer before the emperor the accusation of the Jews."⁹⁰

Pliny remarks of his own administration respecting the Christians:

"There were others under like infatuation; but as they were Roman citizens, I directed them to be sent to the capital."⁹¹ Suetonius states that "All appeals in causes between inhabitants of Rome were assigned every year to the prætor of the city, and, where the provincials were concerned, to men of consular rank; to one of whom the business of each province was referred."⁹²

§ 398. Shipwreck at Melita (Malta).

III.

"And when we were escaped, then we knew that the island was called Melita" (Malta).⁹³

Several persons of distinction have expressed the opinion that the island Malta was not the scene of Paul's shipwreck,

⁸⁵ *Voyage and Shipwreck, Introd.* xv, xvi.

⁸⁶ *Ant.* xx, 6, 2; *Wars*, ii, 12, 6.

⁸⁷ *Wars*. ii, 5, 3.

⁸⁸ *Ib.* ii, 13, 2.

⁸⁹ *Life Josephus*, § 3.

⁹⁰ *Ant.* xviii, 4, 2.

⁹¹ *Epis. to Trajan; comp. Martyr. Ignatius*, c. ii.

⁹² *Augustus*, 33.

⁹³ *Acts* xxviii, 1.

and others have not hesitated to claim the occurrence took place at the island Melita, or Meleda, in the Adriatic Sea or Gulf of Venice. Thus Lord Lindsay says: "This [Malta] is not the Melita where St. Paul was shipwrecked."⁹⁴ Neal affirms: "I am bound to express my entire certainty that Melita is Meleda."⁹⁵ Coleridge adds: "The supposition itself is quite absurd."⁹⁶

All this, however, proves to be the merest conjecture, and is thoroughly refuted by Smith's work reporting the survey and research on all questions involved. His reasoning is too copious for extraction, and too minute for condensation. His conclusions may be sufficiently indicated by brief citations from the work. He says:

"There is one objection to the locality assigned by the Maltese tradition as the scene of the shipwreck which meets us at the very threshold of our inquiry, and which it is necessary to obviate in a work which aims at exhausting the subject. It is maintained by Giorgi, Bryant, Falconer, and others, that it did not take place at Malta at all, but at Meleda, in the Gulf of Venice, an island which was anciently known by the same name as Malta, namely, Melita. But for the above-mentioned reasons I should have been much inclined to have noticed this objection very briefly, thinking, with Joseph Scaliger, that it would not deserve to be confuted if it had not had supporters. But when I find it adopted by modern commentators and biographers, . . . I feel called upon to subject the arguments by which it is supported to a minute and sifting examination."⁹⁷

"The progress of the narrative has brought us to the question whether the traditional locality is in reality that of the shipwreck. Now, if we attend minutely to the narrative, it will be seen that the number of conditions required to be fulfilled, in order to make any locality agree with it, are so numerous as to render it morally impossible to suppose that the agreement which we find here is the effect of chance."⁹⁸

Conybeare and Howson say: "This therefore is the place for summing up the evidence which has been gradually accumulating in proof that it was the modern Malta. We have already seen the almost irresistible inference which follows from the consideration of the direction and rate of drift since the vessel was laid-to under the lee of Clauda. But we shall find that every succeeding indication not only tends to bring to the shore of this island, but to the very bay (*the Cala di San*

⁹⁴ *Letters*, 1, 19.

⁹⁵ *Notices of Dalmatia*.

⁹⁶ *Table Talks*, 185.

⁹⁷ *Introd. to "Voyage,"* xxx-xxxii.

⁹⁸ *Ib.* pp. 127, 128.

Paolo), which has always been the traditional scene of the wreck." 99 M. Rénan says: "They soon learned that they were on the island of Malta." 100 "The Cala di San Paolo at Malta corresponds well to the Acts." 101

IV.

"Now in the neighborhood of the place were lands belonging to the chief man of the island named Publius, who received us and entertained us three days courteously." 102

"The chief man of the island" 103 may mean the principal personage of Maltese society, it may mean distinctively an official title, or it may refer to one who possessed both claims. It is the natural sense that Luke meant the official title. Two *inscriptions* have been discovered in Malta, one written in Greek, the other in Latin, and in both the term is of the same import, and is an official title applied to a Roman knight. He was called "*Primate of the Maltese*." 104

"But when Paul had gathered a bundle of sticks and laid them on the fire, a viper came out by reason of the heat and fastened on his hand. And when the barbarians saw the creature hanging on his hand, they said one to another: No doubt this man is a murderer, whom though he has escaped the sea, yet Justice hath not suffered to live. Howbeit, he shook off the creature into the fire and took no harm, . . . [when] they said that he was a god." 105

Coleridge again adventures a conjectural opinion when he says: "Now, in our Malta there are, I may say, no snakes at all!" 106

The assertion of the merest speculative conclusion is something very different from the assertion of a well-ascertained fact. It is an error to say there are no serpents in Malta; and if there were none, it would not prove that there were not any in Paul's time. Luke distinctly designates the *viper*, 107 which is a venomous reptile. The following citations were written

99 *Life and Epis. of Paul*, ii, 421. 100 *Saint Paul*, 323. 101 *Ib.* 421, 18.

102 *Acts* xxviii, 7.

103 Πρῶτος τῆς νήσου; comp. *Mark* vi, 21; *Acts*, xiii, 50; xxviii, 7.

104 Πρῶτος Μεταίων; and in Latin "*Mel. Primus*," "*Voyage*," 150, 151; Lewin's *Life and Epis. of Paul*, ii, 208, 209.

105 *Acts* xxviii, 3-6.

106 *Table Talk*, 185.

107 Ἐχίδνα, a *Viper*.

by two different parties who visited the island for the purpose of critical observations, and will prove very evidential on the points questioned. The writers are of the highest authority, who traversed the entire region and made thorough investigations. Thomas Lewin, Esq., remarks:

“It has been objected to this account [of Luke]: 1. That there is no wood in Malta, except at Bosquetta; and, 2. That there are no vipers in Malta. How then, it is said, could the apostle have collected the sticks, and how could a viper have fastened upon his hand? But when I visited the Bay of St. Paul in 1851 by sea, I observed trees growing in the vicinity, and there were also fig-trees growing amongst the rocks at the water's edge where the vessel was wrecked. But there is a better explanation still. When I was again at Malta in 1853, I went with two companions to the Bay of St. Paul by land, *and this was the same season of the year as when the wreck occurred.* We now noticed on the shore just opposite the scene of the wreck, *eight or nine stacks of small fagots, and in the nearest stack I counted twenty-five bundles.* They consisted of a kind of thorny heather, and had evidently been cut for firewood; as we strolled about, my companions, whom I had quitted to make observations, *put up a viper, or a reptile having the appearance of one, which escaped into the bundles of sticks.* It may not have been poisonous, but it was like an adder, and was quite different from the common snake. One of my fellow-travelers was quite familiar with the difference between snakes and adders, and could not well be mistaken. After all, therefore, it may be found that *vipers, though rare, still exist at Malta.*”¹⁰⁸

Admiral Smith adds his testimony. He says:

“My lamented friend, the late Dr. Landsborough, in his interesting excursions in Arran has repeatedly noticed the gradual disappearance of the viper from that island since it has become more frequented. . . . Perhaps there is nowhere a surface of equal extent, in so artificial a state as that of Malta is at the present day, and nowhere has the aboriginal forest been more completely cleared; but it by no means follows that this was the case when St. Luke wrote. Indeed, there are traditions and other indications of former woods in the island. We need not, therefore, be surprised that, with the disappearance of the woods, the noxious reptiles which infested them should also disappear.”¹⁰⁹

It is obvious from these facts that there are, even in this day, serpents in Malta, which is the special thing denied; that there are yet fagots of wood gathered in bundles for burning

¹⁰⁸ *Life and Epis. of Paul*, 11, 208.

¹⁰⁹ *Voyage and Shipwreck*, 148, 149.

on the very shores of the shipwreck, as in Paul's time; that a serpent bearing the characteristic marks of the viper, and unlike any other snake, took refuge in a bundle of firewood, exactly as related in Luke's narrative. These facts can not be ignored. Nevertheless, the burden of proof is with the objector by the established rules of logic. It is his part to prove by veritable facts, and not assume or assert without proof, that there are not now, and never were, wood and vipers in Malta, the shipwreck can be shown to be unhistorical. The facts which remain to be refuted are those cited by these persons who purposely visited the island to make critical investigations on the spot, and whose high authority can not be set aside by the merest conjectural assertions, without facts, by those who have never made a personal examination of the island, and have no justifying reasons for their disbelief.

§ 399. The Harbor Puteoli (the modern Pozzuoli).

"After three months we set sail in a ship of Alexandria which had wintered in the island, whose sign was *The Twin Brothers*. And touching at Syracuse, we tarried there three days. And from thence we made a circuit and arrived at Rhegium; and after one day a south wind sprang up, and on the second day we came to Puteoli; . . . and so we came to Rome."¹¹⁰

The ancient harbor of Italy on the Mediterranean where the vessels from Alexandria landed was called by the Italians Puteoli, but the older name given it by the Romans was *Dicæarchia*. It is now called Pozzuoli. Sir James Smith describes this port thus:

"Puteoli was then, as it is now, the most sheltered part of the Bay of Naples. It was the principal port of Southern Italy, and in particular it was the great emporium for the Alexandrian wheat-ships. Seneca, in one of his epistles, gives an interesting and graphic account of the arrival of the Alexandrian fleet. All ships entering the bay were obliged to strike the topsails except wheat-ships, which were allowed to carry theirs. They could therefore be distinguished whenever they hove in sight. It was the practice to send forward fast-sailing vessels to announce the speedy arrival of a fleet."¹¹¹

¹¹⁰Acts xxviii, 11-14.

¹¹¹*Voyage, etc.*, 153, 154.

Suetonius mentions that after the subjugation of the Jews in Judæa, Titus resolved to go to Rome; "therefore, making what haste he could into Italy, he arrived at Puteoli, [and] went to Rome with all possible expedition."¹¹² The late Professor Rénan, of Paris, said: "Puteoli, as we have already said, was that port of Italy most frequented by the Jews. It was there in general that ships from Alexandria discharged their cargoes."¹¹³ Josephus, describing his own shipwreck when journeying to Rome says that at length, he came "to *Dicearchia*, which the Italians call *Puteoli*;"¹¹⁴ that by sail, on a certain occasion, Herod "Agrippa [I] was come to *Puteoli*;"¹¹⁵ and that Herod Antipas and the slave Fortunatus "both sailed to *Dicearchia*,"¹¹⁶ in search of the emperor. Thus the two names given the harbor near Naples were used interchangeably, and it is the same harbor where Paul and his ship's company landed, and he was met by Jewish brethren, and thence pursued his course over the Appian Way through "the Market of Appius" and "the Three Taverns" to Rome. The custom of sending forward "fast-sailing vessels" to discover and announce the approach of the grain-ships from Alexandria, accounts for the fact that the brethren resident at Puteoli, and even at Rome, had opportunity to meet the apostle—the one class at the harbor, and the other at the Three Taverns, which was forty-three miles south of the Capital. The entire distance from Puteoli to Rome was about one hundred and forty-one miles; a distance which Paul and Luke traveled afoot.

§ 400. Paul at Rome (Italy).

V.

"And when we had entered into Rome, the centurion delivered the prisoners to the captain of the Prætorian guard; but Paul was suffered to abide by himself with the soldier that guarded him."¹¹⁷

Ulpián is referred to as authority for the statement that it was the part of the chief ruler of the country under the Ro-

¹¹² *Titus*, v.

¹¹⁵ *Ant.* xviii, 6, 3, 4.

¹¹³ *St. Paul*, 324.

¹¹⁶ *Ib.* xviii, 7, 2.

¹¹⁴ *Life of Josephus*, § 3.

¹¹⁷ *Acts* xxviii, 16.

mans, to determine whether an arrested person should be immured in prison, or should be committed to the keeping of a soldier, or should be placed in charge of securities, or be left to take care of himself."¹¹⁸ It is evident, then, that the prisoners of the Romans in military custody could be treated with severity or lenity, at the discretion of the chief officer of the law, he taking into account the previous character and standing of the prisoner in society. Tacitus makes note of an instance in point, in the treatment of a Roman lady by the Emperor Tiberius, who "took the slaves of [Emilia] Lapida from the guard of the soldiers, and transferred them to the consuls; nor did he suffer them to be examined by torture."¹¹⁹

When Herod Agrippa (I) was young, pursuing his education at Rome, for words of indiscretion spoken to his friend young Caligula disrespectful of the Emperor Tiberius, Agrippa was imprisoned for six months. Through the influence of Antonia, Caligula's grandmother, it was permitted "his freedmen and friends to come to him, and that other things that tended to ease him might be indulged him."¹²⁰

The case of the apostle throughout his period of imprisonment from Jerusalem to Rome illustrates in a remarkable manner, no less the dignity and commanding character of the prisoner than the consideration, and even sympathy, extended to him as a Roman citizen who was not charged with any crime. It was purely a question of religion between Paul and the Jews, and his being conducted in bonds to Rome was on his own "appeal to Cæsar" in order to avoid being judged by those who had already formed a conspiracy against his life. Claudius Lysias, the commandant of the castle Antonia at Jerusalem, not only showed him much courtesy, but in his official letter to the procurator at Cæsarea, he expressly states that the prisoner was merely "accused of questions of their [the Jews'] law, but to have nothing laid to his charge worthy

¹¹⁸ *Digest of Justinian*, xlviii, Tituli 3; De Ulp. 1; comp. Acts xxiv, 23.

¹¹⁹ *Annals*, iii, 22.

¹²⁰ *Josephus, Ant.* xviii, 6, 6, 7.

of death or of bonds.”¹²¹ Even the conscienceless Felix at Cæsarea ordered that “he should be kept in charge, and should have indulgence, and not to forbid any of his friends to minister unto him.”¹²² His successor, Festus, after having made an occasion of much magnificence, presented Paul to King Herod Agrippa II, before whom the apostle made his powerful defense. “Then said Agrippa unto Festus, This man might have been set at liberty, if he had not appealed unto Cæsar.”¹²³

When started upon the voyage to Rome, at Sidon the officer in charge, “Julius, treated Paul kindly, and gave him leave to go unto his friends and refresh himself.”¹²⁴ At Malta, the scene of the shipwreck, Luke narrates how “the barbarians showed us no common kindness; for they kindled a fire and received us all, because of the present rain and because of the cold.”¹²⁵ And “the chief man of the island, named Publius,” “received us and entertained us courteously;” and the people who had been miraculously cured by Paul, “also honored us with many honors; and when we sailed, they put on board such things as we needed.”¹²⁶ Accordingly, when we recall the leniency of the Romans toward the apostle hitherto, we are prepared to understand that, when Paul entered the capital, “he was suffered to abide by himself with a soldier,” “in his own hired dwelling, and received all who came unto him, none forbidding him”¹²⁷ his labors in the gospel. These facts reflect light upon the apostle’s own expressions in writing to brethren elsewhere during the continuance of his present imprisonment at Rome:

“So that my bonds became manifest throughout the whole prætorian guard, and to all the rest; and that most of the brethren in the Lord, being confident through my bonds, are more abundantly bold to speak the word of God without fear.”¹²⁸ “All the saints salute you, especially they that are of Cæsar’s household.”¹²⁹

¹²¹ Acts xxi, 39, 40; xxiii, 26-30.

¹²² *Ib.* xxv, 23-27; xxvi, 32.

¹²³ *Ib.* xxviii, 2.

¹²⁴ *Ib.* xxviii, 16, 30, 31

¹²⁵ *Ib.* iv, 22.

¹²⁶ *Ib.* xxiv, 23.

¹²⁷ *Ib.* xxvii, 3.

¹²⁸ *Ib.* xxviii, 7-10.

¹²⁹ Phil. i, 13, 14.

VI.

If the traditions are historical respecting the last days of the Apostle Paul, he wrote his Second Epistle to Timothy by a lighted taper when immured in the Mamertine prison, which is near the Senate-house, on the Capitoline Hill of Rome. It was written after his second trial, in which he was condemned to die. From the first indictment, which was preferred by vicious Jews of Jerusalem, he was exonerated on trial. In reference to this occasion Paul himself wrote :

“Alexander the coppersmith did me much evil; the Lord render to him according to his works; of whom be thou ware also, for he greatly withstood our words. At my first defense, no one took my part, but all forsook me; may it not be laid to their account. But the Lord stood by me and gave me power, that through me the message might be fully proclaimed, and *that all the Gentiles might hear. And I was delivered out of the mouth of the lion.*”¹³⁰

It has been the constant tradition that upon his second trial, instigated by persons from Ephesus, Paul was condemned to die, at some date between 66–68 A. D. This was under the reign of Nero. It is said that he was led out through the southern gate, which now bears his name, into the *Via Ostiensis*, about two miles, to the “Three Fountains,” where is a natural amphitheater for the accommodation of the vulgar populace, who thronged the Christian prisoner along the way to witness his execution. A small church edifice, built in 1599, is said to mark the spot where the Apostle Paul was beheaded. It is called *S. Paolo alle Tre Fontane*.

¹³⁰ 2 Tim. iv, 14–17; comp. 1 Cor, xv, 32; Ignatius, *Epis. ad Rom.* c. v; and Josephus, *Ant.* xviii, 6, 10.

CHAPTER XIX.

VERIFICATION OF THE NEW TESTAMENT AS HISTORICAL.

I. CONSIDERATION OF SOME POINTS PRELIMINARY TO THE INVESTIGATION.

1. The First Three Centuries of the Christian Era the Old Battleground.
2. Paul's First Four Epistles Concededly Authentic and Credible.
3. Reaction in Rationalistic Criticism on the Chronology.
4. The Nativity of Christ as the Basis of the Christian Era.

II. BOOKS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT AFFIRMED BY ENEMIES TO BE HISTORICAL.

1. The Witness of *Julian*, known as the Apostate, dating 362 A. D.
2. The Witness of *Hierocles*, the Instigator of Persecutions, 303 A. D.
3. The Witness of *Porphyry*, who wrote *against Christian Doctrines*, 295.
4. The Witness of *Lucian*, an Officer of the Roman Government, 160.
5. The Witness of *Celsus*, the Literary Champion of the Enemies, 150.
6. The Witness of *Tacitus* to Fundamental Facts of Christianity, 110.
7. The Witness of *Josephus* to the Life and Death of Christ, 103.

III. TESTIMONY OF THE ENEMIES CONFIRMED BY THE CHRISTIAN WRITERS.

8. The Testimony of *Origin* of Alexandria, 254 A. D.
9. The Testimony of *Tertullian*, the Jurisconsult of Carthage, 200 A. D.
10. The Testimony of *Irenæus*, the Bishop of Lyons, in 170 A. D.
11. The Testimony of *Justin* on "*The Memoirs of the Apostles*," 140 A. D.
12. The Testimony of *Papias*, Bishop of Hierapolis, Phrygia (uncertain).
13. The Testimony of *Clement of Rome*, Companion of Paul, 64-67 A. D.
14. The Testimony of *Barnabas* of Matthew's "*Written*" Gospel, 70 A. D.

IV. SOME COLLATERAL EVIDENCE RESPECTING THE BOOKS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

1. *The Titles* Prefixed to the several Books of these Scriptures.
2. *The Quotations* made from them in Comparison with Classic Writers.
3. *A Table of Citations by Four Eminent Men from the whole New Testament.*

CHAPTER XIX.

VERIFICATION OF THE NEW TESTAMENT AS HISTORICAL.

§ 401. Sources: Biographical Epitomes of Witnesses and Literature.

1. PAPIAS (b. about A. D. 70), who wrote 110-116, and died about 153, was Bishop of Hierapolis in Phrygia in the first half of the second century. Irenæus, mentioning certain matters, says: "And these things are borne witness to in a writing of Papias, the hearer of John, and a companion of Polycarp." (*Against Heresies*, V, c. 33, 4.) Papias wrote a book entitled *Explication of the Lord's Discourses* (Λογίων Κυριακῶν Ἐξηγήσεις), in which he has recorded many historical traditions which had previously been preserved in oral discourse, having been received from the apostles, concerning our Lord's teachings. This work was extant in the fifteenth century, but is now lost, except some fragments preserved in the writings of Irenæus and Eusebius. Jerome also possessed the writings of Papias. Dr. Philip Schaff aptly remarks: "Papias proves the great value which was attached to the oral traditions of the apostles and their disciples in the second century. He stood on the threshold of the new period, when the last witnesses of the Apostolic Age were fast disappearing, and when it seemed to be of the utmost importance to gather the remaining fragments of inspired wisdom which throw light on the Lord's teaching, and guard the Church against errors." (*Hist. Christian Church*, II, 696.) Besides these teachings of our Savior, unrecorded in the Gospels, but transmitted through his apostles, Papias bears witness to the existence of Matthew's Gospel, originally written in Hebrew, to Mark's Gospel, to the Book of Acts, to the First Epistle of Peter, the First Epistle of John, and to the Apocalypse.
2. JOHANN WOLFGANG GOETHE (1749-1832) in youth was carefully educated in the languages, was well acquainted with the Bible, but the Scriptures exerted no influence on his spirit and life. He appears to have been deficient in all spiritual impressions. At the age of nineteen young Goethe went to the University of Leipsic (1768). He then became a novelist and poet, as well as a writer of dramas. In 1775 he became a member of the court by invita-

tion of Charles Augustus, Duke of Saxe-Weimar. He occupied several posts of honor in the government, and finally became Minister of State. Retiring from this position, he became deeply interested in practical and scientific matters, studying with great care, Botany, Comparative Anatomy, Mineralogy, and Optics, making some valuable discoveries in these directions. After his marriage he was regarded as an authority among his people, especially in the way of liberating the German civilization from the bonds of the Middle Ages. In person he was tall and remarkably handsome, reserved, and sometimes haughty and even arrogant in manner, but withal, strangely attractive in social intercourse.

3. SAMUEL PRIDEAUX TREGELLES (1813-1875) was an Englishman of Quaker descent, who was well and classically educated. Studying the Oriental languages as a life-study, his first production was a critical edition of the text of the New Testament from the most ancient manuscripts and versions. He occupied no little time in visiting the great libraries of Europe, making scholarly researches with a view to subsequent productions. Some of the principal works from his pen are *The Book of Revelation, in Connection with the Old Testament* (1836), *The Englishman's Greek Concordance of the New Testament* (1839), *The Englishman's Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon* (1843), *The Greek New Testament* (1857-1872), and many others.
4. ANDREWS NORTON (1786-1853) was born in Massachusetts, graduated at Harvard University in 1804. While serving as tutor at Bowdoin, he delivered a course of lectures on Biblical Criticism in 1813. Upon the organization of the Harvard Divinity School (1819), he was chosen Professor of Sacred Literature, which position he resigned in 1830. In theology he was a Unitarian, and wrote works of character against infidelity. His best production was *The Genuineness of the Gospels* (5 vols.), the last of which was issued after his death (1856). It is a critical work of invaluable worth.
5. ARTHUR PENRHYN STANLEY (1815-1881) was a favorite student of Dr. Thomas Arnold, of Rugby school, who took a number of notable prizes as an essayist at Oxford, graduated at the university college in 1838, and became Professor of Ecclesiastical History at Oxford in 1856, chaplain to the Prince of Wales in 1854, and to Queen Victoria in 1862. He was also distinguished for his defense of "free thought" in the Church of England, in the controversy precipitated by the publication of Bishop Colenso's work on the Pentateuch. Some of Dean Stanley's literary productions are *Essays on the Apostolic Age* (1847), *Epistles to the Corinthians, with Critical Notes* (2 vols. 1855, 14th ed. 1876), *Sinai and Palestine,*

Lectures on the History of the Eastern Church, and A History of the Jewish Church. He was a member of the British branch of the company who revised the translation of the Bible.

6. GEORGE RAWLINSON (b. 1815) is brother of the distinguished Sir Henry C. Rawlinson, who for many years was president of the Royal Geographical Society; also of the Society of Biblical Archæology, in England. George Rawlinson graduated at Trinity College, Oxford, in 1839; delivered the *Bampton Lectures* in 1859, and in 1861 was chosen Professor of Ancient History at Oxford. He is the author of a number of very valuable works, among which may be named *The Five Great Monarchies of the Eastern World* (4 vols. 1862-1867), *A Manual of Ancient History* (1869), *History of Egypt and Babylon* (1885), and *Historical Evidences of the Truth of the Scripture Records* (New York, 1859). This last work is exceedingly interesting to Christians and critical scholars, as directed against the prevailing disbelief in the truth and authority of the Holy Scriptures in the present day.

§ 402. The Verification of the New Testament as Historical.

We have no less weighty an inquiry before us than this: Whence spring our Gospels? for on the origin of these books hinge their trustworthiness and all their value. . . . With the person of Jesus, Christianity stands or falls.—TISCHENDORF.

Christianity alone of all religions claims to be founded, not on fancy or feeling, but on Fact and Truth.—STANLEY.

I believe the four Gospels are genuine; for I see in them an emanation of that greatness which proceeded from the person of Christ, such as was never before manifested on earth.—GOETHE.

The sayings of Jesus, being especially characteristic of their time, have all the signs of an exalted and reticent originality, of a Divine sanctity and force; [and] bear the stamp of a spirit of development which no evangelist, Jew or Gentile, nor even Paul himself, would have known how to invent.—KEIM.

I confess to you that the majesty of the Scriptures strikes me with admiration, as the purity of the Gospel has its influence upon my heart. It is more inconceivable that several men should have united to forge the Gospel than that a single person should have furnished the Subject of it. The marks of its truth are so striking and inimitable, that the inventor would be more astonishing than the hero.—ROUSSEAU.

So great is the certainty respecting the Gospels that even the heretics themselves testify to them, and each one of them, starting out from these, endeavors to establish his own doctrines.—IRENÆUS.

The apprehension has grown into a certainty, that the Scriptures are the Word of God, and are of Divine authority.—TREGELLES.

ARGUMENT.

That the disciples of Christ wrote the four Gospels is a fact constantly assumed or asserted by the enemies of Christianity, especially during the first four centuries. In truth, they make that circumstance their basis in assailing the Christian religion. This conviction is shared and amply confirmed by patristic testimony. Some learned extremists at first dated the several books of the New Testament nearly through the second Christian century; but criticism has compelled a general retrocession in this particular. For these writings, though dateless as to modern methods, bear the coloring of the age and antiquity of their origin. For obvious reasons the apostolic writers omitted their signatures to the four Gospels and Acts of the Apostles, while in contradistinction, the Epistles bear the authenticating autographs of their several writers. Nevertheless, so far from causing doubt of the authorship by the omission of signatures in case of the historical books of the New Testament, in the minds of contemporaries and their successors, foes and friends were entirely agreed in holding to the apostolicity of these writings as unquestioned and unquestionable. Both classes even mention the names of the respective writers as well understood. Both held that the sacred books were regarded by Christians as of supreme authority. Sometimes the Gospels were called *Memoirs* of Jesus. By the rules governing in cases of historical evidence, universally applicable, these books were kept and found in the proper custody. The numerous references to, and citations from, their contents furnish a complete *catena* of proof, extending from the time of Constantine the Great, through whom Christianity became the religion of the State, back to the period when the New Testament writings were written and published first to the world.

1. A Retrocession made by Adverse Critics respecting the Dates of these Sacred Writings.
2. The Main Facts of Christianity mentioned in the New Testament, attested by Enemies.
3. The Authorship of the Several Books ascribed by Foes to Christ's own Disciples.
4. Three-fourths of all the Writers of the New Testament are expressly named by Foes.
5. Reasons why Writers of the Historical Books omitted to subscribe their Signatures.
6. Confirmation of the Adversaries' Testimony by that of the Early Christian Writers.

7. A *Catena* of Proofs extending from Constantine back to the very Apostles of Jesus.
8. The Authenticity and Antiquity of these Scriptures attested by many Early Citations.

The first three centuries of the Christian era are the old battleground between Christian scholarship and Destructive Criticism respecting the historical existence of the New Testament Scriptures, as well as of Christianity itself. There is no question made about the historicity of Christianity after its establishment as the religion of the State by Constantine in 325 A. D. It would be, therefore, a waste of labor and time to prove what no one denies. As the discussion of this subject is thus restricted to the first three hundred years, it is proposed to establish a chain of proofs extending from the time of Constantine back to the Apostolic Age, beginning with the remotest period from the origin of the Christian religion, proceeding upward in chronology toward the apostles until we stand within hearing of their original utterances. The investigation to ascertain the origin, the authenticity, and historicity of these Scriptures is limited to this period.

§ 403. The Ancient Battleground.

Meantime, as a point preliminary to the discussion, it is especially worthy of note that all living critics of learning or distinction, of whatever school of thought, now fully admit that Paul's first four Epistles—namely, Romans, the two Corinthians, and Galatians—are truly authentic, credible and evidential. Baur used these very writings to assail the harmony and faith of the apostles' teachings. Of the thirteen Pauline Epistles, Hilgenfeld admits seven, and Rénan nine, with Acts as genuine and authentic. Now, if the first four Epistles of Paul contain such evidential worth as claimed by Baur in his assault, they certainly are of equal value evidentially on the Christian side, for the defense. These Epistles were written A. D. 54–58. That is, they date within a quarter of a century after Christ's

§ 404. Paul's Four Epistles.

crucifixion. During this period nearly all the twelve apostles were still living, and were accessible to Paul, from whom he would easily and naturally learn any great facts of the personal life and ministry of Jesus Christ.¹ Paul's conversion is generally placed in A. D. 37. Just before Baur's death in 1860, he confessed that the apostle's conversion was to him an insolvable mystery—"amounting to a miracle."

What, then, is the gain to Christian evidence by the universal concession of the first four Pauline Epistles whose contents are held to be authentic and historical by extreme critics? Dr. Philip Schaff thus briefly summarizes the conceded facts: *

"The leading facts in the life of Christ: his Divine mission;¹ his birth from a woman;² of the royal house of David;³ his holy life and example;⁴ his betrayal,⁵ passion, and death for the sins of the world;⁶ his resurrection on the third day;⁷ his repeated manifestations to his disciples⁸ [and others]; his ascension and exaltation to the right hand of God,⁹ whence he will return to judge mankind;¹⁰ the adoration of Christ as Messiah,¹¹ the Lord and Savior from sin;¹² the eternal Son of God;¹³ also the election of the Twelve,¹⁴ the institution of Baptism,¹⁵ and the Lord's Supper;¹⁶ the mission of the Holy Spirit,¹⁷ the founding of the Church.¹⁸ Among other facts may be added the account of Paul's conversion and call to his apostleship by the personal revelation of Jesus Christ;¹⁹ the knowledge we have of miracles wrought by the apostles especially by Paul;²⁰ and the early controversy in the Church between the Judaizers from Jerusalem and the Christians of Antioch in Syria."²¹

A wonderful reaction and retrocession in the chronology of the New Testament is to be noted among the extreme critics

* *Hist. of Christian Church*, vol. i, 213, and following.

¹ Gal. iv, 4, 5.

² *Ib.* iv, 4.

³ Rom. i, 3.

⁴ *Ib.* xi, 16; 1 Cor. xi, 1; 2 Cor. v, 21.

⁵ 1 Cor. xi, 23.

⁶ Rom. v, 8-21; viii, 3; xiv, 15; 1 Cor. i, 23; ii, 2; v, 7; xv, 3; 2 Cor. v, 21; Gal. i, 4; iii, 13; iv, 4-6; vi, 14.

⁷ 1 Cor. xv, 4, 20; Rom. i, 3; iv, 24, 25; vi, 4, 9; viii, 11; x, 7, 9; 1 Cor. vi, 14; Gal. i, 1.

⁸ 1 Cor. xv, 4-8; 45-49.

⁹ Rom. x, 6; viii, 34; 1 Cor. xv, 47.

¹⁰ Rom. i, 32; ii, 2, 16.

¹¹ Rom. ix, 5; xi, 36; Gal. i, 3-5.

¹² Rom. i, 16; vi, 10; viii, 3; 1 Cor. ii, 8; xv, 3; 2 Cor. v, 14, 15, 21; Gal. iii, 13; iv, 4, 5.

¹³ Rom. i, 3, 4; viii, 3; ix, 5; Gal. ii, 20; iv, 4.

¹⁴ 1 Cor. xv, 5; Gal. i, 19.

¹⁵ Rom. vi, 3-10; 1 Cor. i, 13, 14, 16; xii, 13; Gal. iii, 27.

¹⁶ 1 Cor. x, 16; xi, 23-26.

¹⁷ Rom. viii, 9, 14; xi, 13; xv, 19; 1 Cor. ii, 10, 12, 14; 2 Cor. i, 22; iii, 3, 17.

¹⁸ 1 Cor. iii, 11.

¹⁹ Gal. i, 1, 15, 16, 18; ii, 1-11; 1 Cor. ix, 1; xv, 8.

²⁰ Rom. xv, 18, 19; 1 Cor. ii, 4; ix, 2; 2 Cor. xii, 12.

²¹ Gal. ii, 21; v, 2-4: cf. Acts xv.

of the negative school. Frederick Christian Baur, head of the Tübingen wing, at first dated the origin of John's Gospel at A. D. 170; Hilgenfeld, at 140; Keim, at 130; Rénan, at 117-138. Some extremists have modified their own views, and some have criticised others as holding positions which were fictitious, uncritical, and untenable, especially those of the Tübingen school of criticism. Among the correcting critics are Pfeleiderer, Ritschl, Holtzmann, Lipsius, and particularly Weizsacker, Reuss, and Keim. Hilgenfeld affirms that "it can not be denied that Baur went beyond the bounds of moderation." Schenkel, after investigation, says that he is forced to the conviction that "the Acts of the Apostles is a more worthy source of information than is commonly allowed on the part of modern criticism." Ewald defends Acts and the Fourth Gospel against Baur. Keim criticises Baur's views of the antagonism between Paul and Peter as untenable. Holtzmann is said to have placed the chronology of the Gospels within the period of the Apostolic Age, and confessed that he knew no good reason why they should not be accorded the dates commonly accepted (A. D. 55, 56). Harnack does not hesitate to place the Gospels within the lifetime of the apostles. "Strauss, who in his first *Leben Jesu* (1835) had represented the Gospel history as an innocent and unconscious myth or poem of the religious imagination of the second generation of Christians, but in his second *Leben Jesu* (1864) somewhat modified his views, at last (1873) gave up the whole as a bad job." Matthew Arnold, "one of the boldest and broadest of the broad-school divines and critics," regarded Baur as "an unsafe guide," and held that the discourses of John were "the sublimest of all human compositions, full of heavenly glories."*

In this preliminary statement, it may be mentioned that the *Nativity of Jesus Christ* is the supreme fact that gave origin and authenticity to the Christian era. It so happened

* See Schaff, *Hist. Christ. Church*, 1, 209-217.

in the sixth century a learned monk, named Dionysius Exiguus, endeavored to ascertain by calculation the exact year and day when Jesus was born at Bethlehem.

§ 406. The Basis of the Christian Era. He did not originate the era, but reckoned its chronology. The result of his studies was not exact, but closely approximate, and perhaps the best that could be done with the *data* at his command; for his induction was necessarily based upon general and indefinite terms. He was entirely successful in making clear and certain the *fact* of Christ's birth, but not the exact *date*. It was the usage of ancient historians to record important events as occurring within a certain period of time, as within the reign of a given emperor or ruler, which, for authenticating time, answered all the demands of the ancient peoples. While the year of the nativity can not be ascertained with *absolute certitude*, the general *consensus* of the scholars who have made the most careful investigation is to the effect that our present current chronology begins the Christian era about four years too late. It is however quite impossible practically to make the desired correction, since all the nations of Christendom have adopted the present chronology, and for so many centuries it has given date to all legal documents, institutions, and history. For every man of business now places the date of the day, month, and year upon all documents to give them authentic form and legal effect, as all banks and business houses daily attest by their books. But in this careful chronological notation, every business man recognizes and certifies to the historical existence of Jesus Christ who furnished the origin and foundation to the Christian era; for it was the fact and force of his character that swept away the more ancient chronologies of the nations wherever Christianity has gone and obtained a foothold. It is the introduction of a new order and course, a new departure in the world's history. It is the historical life of our Lord which gave also occasion and origin to the four Gospels: and all the Epistles and the Apocalypse of the New

Testament are based upon that fact. If his Nativity could be proved to be a fiction, these Scriptures would be bankrupted of all their wealth of truth and significance.

PROOFS THAT THE BOOKS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT ARE
HISTORICAL.

It should be carefully remarked in the outset that neither Tacitus who lived in the first century, nor Celsus of the second century, nor Porphyry of the third century, nor yet Hierocles or Julian of the fourth century, §407. Affirmed by Enemies. in any instance, denied the antiquity and apostolicity of the several books of the New Testament. Upon the contrary, they distinctly affirm these particulars, making many references to these writings as reliable, and sometimes even correctly mention the author's names. And what is the more remarkable is the circumstance, that while thus recognizing the authorship of the Evangelists and apostles in the Gospels and Epistles, in no instance did these adversaries of Christianity make a citation from any book of the *Apocryphal* or spurious books of the New Testament, as being authoritative either for themselves or for the Christians. That is, these adversaries themselves discriminated between the apostolic and the spurious writings which arose in the middle of the second Christian century.

What, then, had these enemies of the Christian religion to say respecting the historicity of these books of Scripture, of which they made so much? Let us begin with a Roman Emperor of the fourth century, whose testimony will serve as a *connecting link in the chain of evidence* extending from the Christianity which is acknowledged to be historical, back to the life and labors of the apostles. I refer to—

1. Julian, known as "the Apostate" (b. A. D. 331), who assumed the purple and the crown in the year 361. That this emperor was an enemy of Christianity can not be denied, as his literary works, his edicts, letters, and orations abundantly

prove. He was pleased to call Jesus "the Galilean," and Christians "the Galileans." Having deposed the Christian bishop, Athanasius, he banished him from Egypt; whereupon the Christians, in the name of the city of Alexandria, petitioned Julian for the bishop's return and restoration to office. This was his reply:

"By the gods, ye men of Alexandria, I am ashamed that any Alexandrian should acknowledge himself a Galilean. Alexander, the Ptolemies, and other princes, their founders and patrons, were worshipers of the gods, and had not raised their constitution to its grandeur by the words of Jesus, nor by the doctrine of the hateful Galileans." "By the madness of the Galileans, all things are brought to the brink of ruin; and now we are all safe by the goodness of the gods." "Forbear to converse with servants, children, and wives of the Galileans, who are impious towards the gods, and prefer impiety to religion." "We ought to pity rather than hate men who suffer the greatest calamity; for indeed true religion [idolatry] is the greatest good, and, on the contrary, impiety is the greatest of evils; which calamity they bring upon themselves, who, forsaking the immortal gods, betake themselves to dead men."²²

About A. D. 362, Julian witnessed to the account of certain facts as being authentic, which are mentioned in the history of Jesus and his apostles: The birth of Christ; its connection with the enrollment of Cyrenius; his incarnation; the miracles of Jesus and Paul; the Four Gospels, whose authors are named; Acts of the Apostles; the Epistles to the Romans; both Epistles to the Corinthians; that to the Galatians, and the First Epistle of Peter. That is, he cites the foregoing facts, perverting the most of them; but he actually names five of the seven or eight authors of the New Testament. The following citations will sufficiently prove, not only the existence of the sacred books in the time of Julian, but also the facts found in their contents.

a) *Birth of Christ.* "Jesus whom you celebrate was one of Cæsar's subjects. If you dispute it, I will prove it. . . . For yourselves allow that he was enrolled with his father and mother in the time of Cyrenius." "But Jesus having persuaded a few among you, and those the worst of men, has now been celebrated about three hundred

²² Cited from the original in *Lardner's Works*, vii, 648, 596, 645, 651.

years."²³ This testimony witnesses, (1) To the antiquity of the Nativity; (2) Places the event within the reign of Augustus Cæsar; (3) Connects Christ's birth with the *first* enrollment of Cyrenius, which is now shown to have occurred B. C. 4; (4) And finally, that what he says, the Christians themselves maintain; but if they dispute it, he will prove it—presumably by their own sacred books, which he obviously had in his possession, and from which he makes not a few citations, as will be seen.

β) *Christ's Incarnation.* Julian adds respecting the Christians: "They say they agree with Isaiah who prophesieth, 'Behold a Virgin shall conceive and shall bear a son.'" But "she was not a virgin who was married. . . . Grant [however] that this is said of him [Jesus], does he say that God should be born of a virgin? But they are continually calling Mary the Mother of God." "Neither is he of Judah; and how should he be when, according to you, he was not born of Joseph, but of the Holy Ghost."²⁴ "When you reckon up the genealogy of Joseph, you carry it up to Judah; but you have not been able to contrive this dexterously; for Matthew and Luke have been shown to differ with one another about the genealogy."²⁵

The interesting question here is, How did Julian know what Matthew and Luke say about the genealogy of Jesus or Joseph, and how did he know that they differed from each other, and that both continued the line back to Judah, *unless those Gospels were in existence and were at that time in Julian's possession?* It is true that the two genealogical tables do differ; and it was intentional, for different purposes. Matthew, writing for the Jews, cites the Jewish Scriptures to prove their predictions of the Messiah fulfilled in Christ, and accordingly must trace his descent along the *royal line*, from David down. On the other hand, Luke, writing for the Gentiles, omitted the Jewish argument, and showed his *natural* descent, in that he was the Redeemer of all mankind. Each one, therefore, conducted his special argument for the instruction and persuasion of those for whom he specially wrote.

γ) *Books of the New Testament.* "For neither Paul, Matthew, Mark, nor Luke has dared to call Jesus God. But honest John, understanding that a great multitude of men in the cities of Greece and Italy were seized with this distemper, and hearing likewise, as I suppose, that the tombs of Peter and Paul were respected and frequented, . . . he

²³ *Lardner's Works*, vii, 626, 627.

²⁴ *Ib.* 629, 625.

²⁵ *Ib.* 625; comp. Matt. i, 18, 20; Luke i, 85.

then presumed to advance that doctrine."²⁶ "How, then, is Jesus said in the Gospels to command, 'Go teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost?'"²⁷ "When a certain disciple said, Lord, suffer me to go and bury my father, he answered: Follow thou me, and let the dead bury their dead."²⁸

Here Julian mentions "*the Gospels*," as such, cites several passages from them, and names properly five of the seven or eight writers of the New Testament. He also argues from the passages which he quotes. To find these Scriptures in the hands of enemies who have studied and become familiar with them, and argued from them, implies that the antiquity, authorship, as well as the historical existence of these writings are acknowledged by such adversaries. But no spurious writing known as "apocryphal," which appeared in the middle of the second century, is cited as authoritative.

Julian next refers to an early Christian movement in their care of the poor, which is recorded in Acts:²⁹

"It having so happened, as I suppose, that the poor were neglected by our priests, the impious Galileans, observing this, have addicted themselves to this kind of humanity, and, by the show of such good offices, have recommended the worst of things. For beginning with their love-feasts and ministry of the tables, as they call it—for not only the name but the thing itself is common among them—they have drawn away the faithful to impiety."

The emperor evidences a familiar knowledge of at least five *Epistles* of the New Testament. Thus he refers to *Romans*:³⁰

"Do you [Christians] show me some place where that is said which is affirmed by Paul with so much assurance, that Christ is the end of the law." And again Julian asks the Christians: "Why are you not circumcised? To which they answer: Paul says, It is the circumcision of the heart, not that of the flesh."

First Corinthians:³¹ "They say [*i. e.*, the Christians], We can not keep the feast of unleavened bread or the passover, because Christ has once been sacrificed for us." "Be not deceived: neither idolaters, nor adulterers, nor effeminate, nor abusers of themselves with mankind, nor thieves, nor covetous, nor drunkards, nor revilers, shall inherit the

²⁶ *Lardner's Works*, vii, 628, 629.

²⁷ *Ib.* 637; comp. Matt. xxviii, 19.

²⁸ *Ib.* 637; comp. Matt. viii, 21, 22; Luke ix, 59, 60.

²⁹ Acts vi, 1-7; *Lard.* vii, 645, 646.

³⁰ Rom. x, 4; *Lard.* vii, 633.

³¹ 1 Cor. v, 7; *Lard.* vii, 633, 634; 1 Cor. vi, 9-11; *Lard.* vii, 634, 635; 1 Cor. viii, 7-10; *Lard.* vii, 638.

kingdom of God. And you are not ignorant, brethren, that such were you also. But ye are washed, but ye are sanctified in the name of Jesus Christ." He says: "You see they were such; but they had been sanctified and washed, having been cleansed and scoured with water, which penetrates even to the soul. And baptism, which can not heal the leprosy, nor the gout, nor dysentery, nor any other distemper of the body, takes away adulteries, extortions, and all other sins of the soul." "Why do you meddle with the Greek learning, since the reading of your own Scriptures is sufficient for you? And, indeed, it might be of more importance to restrain men from reading the Greek authors than from eating things sacred to idols. For by that also Paul says, 'He that eats is not hurt. But the conscience of the brother who sees it, is offended,' according to you."

Galatians:³² Cyril, who reviewed and refuted the work of Julian against the Christians, makes this notation, which evidences Julian's knowledge of this Epistle:

"And moreover this daring gentleman reviles the chief of the apostles, Peter, and says he was a hypocrite, and was reproved by Paul for living sometimes after the manner of the Greeks, and at other times after the manner of the Jews."

The Scriptures here collated are by no means exhaustive of Julian's citations and references; but they are sufficient, and demonstrative of the fact that these writings existed previously, and now were in the hands alike of friends and foes who were familiar with their contents.

δ) *Miracles*. Julian *did not deny* the historicity of miracles, but he tried to minify and disparage them as evidence of Christ's divine authority, by paralleling his works by those of the magicians.³³ John Chrysostom (347-407), after mentioning that when Christianity had become established, in comparison with the beginning, miracles were less frequent, says: "Yet in our time, in the reign of Julian, who surpassed all men in impiety there were many miracles."³⁴ Julian says of Jesus:

"Who rebuked the winds, and walked on the seas, and cast out demons, and, as you will have it, made the heaven and the earth." And again: "But Jesus having persuaded a few among you, . . . hav-

³² *Lardner's Works*, 11, 11, 12, 633.

³³ *Lard.* vii, 622, 627.

³⁴ *Homily on Matt.* iv, §2, vol. x. p. 21.

ing done nothing in his lifetime worthy of remembrance, unless one thinks it a mighty matter to heal lame and blind people, and exorcise demoniacs in the villages of Bethsaida and Bethany." "Paul exceeded all the jugglers and impostors that ever were."³⁵

If, now, we move upward in the stream of time about sixty years toward the apostles, we have the testimony of

2. Hierocles, the prefect of Alexandria, born about A. D. 253, and ruled in Egypt in 303, during the terrible persecution of Dioclesian which was ordered that year against the Christians, of which persecution Hierocles was the chief instigator. That he, in common with other intelligent heathen, was familiar with these Christian Scriptures, and knew that they were held in reverential authority by the Church, is obvious from several considerations. One is, that for the first time in the history of heathen persecution, the Christians were required to bring forward and burn in public their sacred books, under penalty of being burned. Now, evidently they must have existed previously, or they could not be burned; and it were foolish to suppose that *the government ordered that to be burned which did not exist!* This circumstance in a large sense accounts for the fact that we have now no earlier manuscripts of the Greek text than A. D. 325. Hierocles witnesses to the genuineness of these Scriptures when he refers to at least five of the writers of the New Testament. He seeks to disparage the writers of the sacred books, but in no instance disputes the genuineness or the antiquity of the writings. Rather, he accepts them as being apostolical, but indulges in reviling the apostles, instead of refuting them. He wrote a work entitled "*To the Christians,*" instead of *against the Christians.* A professional philosopher, teaching philosophy, without understanding the character of Christianity, he indulges in the unphilosophical spirit in denouncing it as "a superstition," as "foolish," "impious, neglecting the deities by whom the world is governed," "contrary to the established

³⁵ *Lard.* vii, pp. 627, 622.

laws," "prejudicial to the interests of mankind," and "exposing men to the displeasure of the gods."³⁶ Lactantius, who refuted Hierocles's work, says:

"This writer endeavors to overthrow Christ's miracles, though he does not deny the truth of them; he aims to show that like things, and even greater, were done by Apollonius. He says: 'Christ, it seems, must be reckoned a magician, because he did many wonderful things; but Apollonius is more able, because, . . . when Domitian would have put him to death, he escaped ['vanishing away at his trial before Domitian in the presence of all the great men of Rome']; 'whereas, Christ was apprehended and crucified.'"³⁷ Hierocles says: "It is also reasonable to think that the actions of Jesus have been magnified by Peter and Paul and others like them [*i. e.*, the four Evangelists]; ignorant men, liars and impostors."³⁸ "They are continually crying up Jesus for opening the eyes of the blind and other like works."³⁹ "Christ must be reckoned a magician, because he did many wonderful things."⁴⁰ "We do not esteem [Apollonius], who did these things as a god, but a man favored by the gods;" "whereas they, for the sake of a few tricks, call Jesus God." "Jesus ascended into heaven."⁴¹

Huet is the authority for the statement that "Philostratus transferred many things from the history of Christ into his Life of Apollonius,"⁴² the work upon which Hierocles founded his writing assailing Christianity. Now as to Hierocles:

1. To criticise the writings of Peter and Paul, implies he had them then in his possession.
2. He does not deny the genuineness of their writings, but rather affirms their authorship.
3. He seeks to disparage their good fame by calling names: "ignorant men, liars, impostors."
4. He affirms Christ's miracles in his "giving sight to the blind, and other such works."
5. He explains miracles by saying: "He must be a magician, for he did many wonderful tricks."
6. He seems amazed at the Christians, "who, for the sake of a few tricks, call Jesus God."
7. After all his disparagements, Hierocles admits that "Jesus ascended into heaven."

We are now within the era of the first three hundred years after the crucifixion, and considerably less than that after the

³⁶ *Lard.* vii. 474.

³⁷ *Ib.* 476, 512.

³⁸ *Ib.* 479.

³⁹ *Ib.* 478.

⁴⁰ *Ib.* 476.

⁴¹ *Ib.* 478, 479, 494

⁴² *Ib.* 493.

writing of nearly all the books of the New Testament. Most of these sacred writers are named and known; the capital facts of Christ's history—namely, the crucifixion and his ascension into heaven—are acknowledged by adversaries; his miraculous powers are admitted in having opened the eyes of the blind, and other such signs and wonders. They also note with express displeasure that the Christians call Jesus God. The next adverse witness is—

3. Porphyry, who was born at Tyre, in Phœnicia, in the year 233, and wrote about 295. He is named "Bataneotes" by both Jerome and Chrysostom.⁴³ He is said to have been a schoolfellow of the famous Christian scholar, Origen.⁴⁴ Socrates in his *Ecclesiastical History* mentions Porphyry as having once been a Christian; but by reason of having been beaten by some Christians at Cæsarea, he renounced Christianity, and became one of its most ardent and noted enemies.⁴⁵ He wrote *Against the Doctrines of the Christians*,⁴⁶ a work in fifteen books, mere fragments of which now remain. By the imperial edict of Constantine it was consigned to the flames, and his name and fame made infamous. In a letter the emperor says :

"As Arius has imitated the impious and profane, it is but just that he should undergo the same infamy with him. As therefore Porphyry, that enemy of true piety, has received a fit reward for his impious writings against religion, so that he is made infamous to all future times, and covered with reproach, and his impious writings have been destroyed,"⁴⁷ etc.

Theodosius the younger, in A. D. 449, abolished the few remaining copies which had escaped the fire.⁴⁸

Porphyry refers distinctly to Matthew, Mark, John, and Acts, as well as to several of the Pauline Epistles. The several writers of the Gospels are thus mentioned :

⁴³ *Lard.* vii, 392. ⁴⁴ *Mill.*, *Ib.* 393. ⁴⁵ *Lib.* iii, c. 23, p. 200; see *Lard.* vii, 392, 393.

⁴⁶ Κατὰ χριστιανῶν λόγους.

⁴⁷ *Socrates*, *Ecc. Hist.* 1, i, c. ix, p. 32; cited by *Lard.* vii, 395.

⁴⁸ *Lard.* vii, 396.

“Your Evangelist Matthew was so ignorant as to say,” etc.; and again in the plural number: “The Evangelists, the better to impose a miracle upon the ignorant people, say: ‘Our Lord walked on the sea.’”⁴⁹ He cites John’s Gospel thus: “If Christ be the way of salvation, the Truth and the Life, and only those who believe in him can be saved, what became of the men who lived before his coming?”⁵⁰ “If the Son of God be Word, he must be either outward word, or inward word. But he is neither this nor that. Therefore he is not the Word.”⁵¹

He also refers to several incidents in Paul’s experience which are recorded in the Book of Acts, such as the circumcision of Timothy,⁵² the apostle’s vow at Cenchrea,⁵³ and his conduct at Jerusalem by the advice of James, the Lord’s brother, in order to disarm certain Jews of their charges against the apostle.⁵⁴ Porphyry also cites the First Epistle to Corinthians: “Unto the Jews I became as a Jew, that I might gain the Jews.”⁵⁵ He refers also to two circumstances which Paul has recorded in respect to his relations with Peter in the Epistle to the Galatians. The first reference is to Paul’s going to Jerusalem and conferring only with Peter and James.⁵⁶ Porphyry censures Paul for not conferring with the other apostles also! Referring to the disputation between Paul and Peter at Antioch, when Paul “withstood Peter to the face, because he was to be blamed,” Porphyry asserts that “Peter and Paul had a childish quarrel with one another, and that Paul burned with envy at the virtues of Peter, and had written in a boasting manner of things which either he never did, or, if he did, it was mere peevishness to blame that in another which he had been guilty of himself.”⁵⁷

Porphyry admits that the apostles wrought miracles. He says:

“Ignorant and indigent men, because they had nothing, performed some signs by magical art—which is no great matter, for the magicians in Egypt, and many others, have wrought signs. Let it be granted, as

⁴⁹ *Lard.* vii, 424, 425.

⁵⁰ *Ib.* 439.

⁵¹ *Ib.* 427, 428.

⁵² *Acts* xvi, 1-3.

⁵³ *Ib.* xviii, 18.

⁵⁴ *Ib.* xxi, 18-24.

⁵⁵ *1 Cor.* ix, 20; *Lard.* vii, 431. ⁵⁶ *Gal.* i, 17-19.

⁵⁷ *Ib.* ii, 11-21; comp. *Lard.* vii, 431.

you say, the apostles wrought signs, that they might enrich themselves with the treasures of rich women whom they had perverted.”⁵⁸ “And now people wonder that this *distemper* has oppressed the city so many years, Æsculapius and the other gods no longer conversing with men. For since Jesus has been honored, none have received any public benefits from the gods!”⁵⁹

This adversary of Christianity tries to criticise those who interpreted the Divine Word. He says:

“An example of this absurd method may be observed in a man whom I saw when I was very young, who was then in great esteem, and is so still, for the writings which he has left behind him; I mean Origen, whose authority is very great with the teachers of this doctrine. . . . But Origen, a Greek, and educated in the Greek sentiment, went over to the *barbarian temerity*,⁶⁰ to which he devoted himself, and corrupted . . . the principles of literature which he had received; as to his life, living a Christian and contrary to the laws.”⁶¹

To the credit of Porphyry it is said that, whatever his opposition to the apostles and the Christians, he invariably referred to Jesus Christ in terms of real respect. Colonia says:

“He makes the goddess Hecate say, and he acknowledges himself, that Jesus Christ is a man illustrious for his piety, and that he is more powerful than Æsculapius and all the other [Greek] gods.”⁶² Dr. Dodridge says: “Porphyry also, though an inveterate enemy to Christianity, not only allowed there was such a man as Christ, but honored him as a most wise and pious man, *translated into heaven as being approved by the gods*, and accordingly quotes some Oracles referring to his sufferings and virtues, with their subsequent rewards.”⁶³

We shall now advance upward to a period within a century of the publication of the books of the New Testament. The first witness for that time is—

4. Lucian, of Samasota in Syria, born A. D. 124. He was an important officer of the Roman Government at Alexandria, in Egypt. He wrote a letter to one Cronius respecting the death of a certain Peregrinus, otherwise called Proteus, who,

⁵⁸ Jerome, cited by *Lard.* 442.

⁵⁹ Euseb. *Evang. Preparation*, cited by *Lard.* 437, 438.

⁶⁰ Τὸ βάρβαρον ἐξωκείλε τὸ δόλημα = lit. “drove headlong in the barbarian adventure.”

⁶¹ Euseb. *Ecl. Hist.*, cited in *Lard.* vii, 397.

⁶² Cited in *Lard.* vii, 445. ⁶³ *Ib.* 445.

in the sixth decade of the second century, immediately after the celebration of the sacred Olympic games, publicly burned himself to death "in the eyes of all Greece." Although he represents Paul in terms of disrespect, he pays a tribute of praise to Christ and the Christians generally of that period. He says:

"It is incredible what expedition they use when any of their friends are known to be in trouble. In a word, they spare nothing upon such an occasion." "They also have a sovereign contempt for the things of this world, and trust one another with them without any particular security." "For these miserable men have no doubt that they shall be immortal, and live forever; therefore they condemn death, and many surrender themselves to sufferings." "They still worship that great man who was crucified in Palestine, because he introduced into the world this new religion." "Moreover, their first Lawgiver taught them that they were all brethren when once they have turned and renounced the gods of the Greeks, and worship that Master of theirs who was crucified, and engage to live according to his laws."⁶⁴

"When the Galilean, half bald, long nosed, who traveled through the air to the third heaven, and there learned the most extraordinary things, came to me, he renewed us by water. . . . I entreat you, . . . though, with your Master, you should be taken up and admitted to unspeakable mysteries."⁶⁵

The references to the Scriptures are to Acts, Corinthians, and apparently to other Pauline Epistles, as Philippians and Titus, also to Hebrews, and frequently to the Book of Life in Revelation.

A SUMMARY.

A summary may now be given of the points in evidence furnished by the last three adversaries of the Christian religion.

1. Hierocles affirms the miracles of Jesus; admits that he ascended into heaven; and that the Christians in his period, and earlier, were accustomed to deify Jesus Christ. He also acknowledges the apostolic authorship of Peter and Paul, of Matthew, Luke, and John, in respect to the several Gospels, Acts, and the Pauline Epistles to the Corinthians and the Galatians. Thus five of the seven or eight writers of the New

⁶⁴ *Lard.* vii, 280, 279.

⁶⁵ *Ib.* 287.

Testament are named and admitted, as already in his own possession.

2. Porphyry mentions Christ's character and power in strong commendation; acknowledges that he wrought many miracles; affirms that he was superior to all the heathen gods whom he worshiped, and, finally, that Jesus ascended into heaven. Referring to the Gospels, he expressly calls the writers "the Evangelists," cites directly from the Gospels of Matthew and John, and makes specific references to Acts, Corinthians, and to Galatians. Moreover, he admits the authorship of Peter and Paul, and acknowledges the miracles of the apostles after Christ's ascension.

3. Lucian states the capital fact that Christ was crucified in Palestine, and the reason of the fact, "because he introduced into the world this new religion." He was therefore recognized by adversaries as the Founder of Christianity. He also alludes to Paul's description of "a certain man" who was carried up to the third heaven and heard things unspeakable. Reference is made to Acts, Corinthians, possibly to Philippians and Titus, but particularly to Hebrews and Revelation.

4. So these writings existed in the middle of the second century as authoritative with the Christians, and the several incidents alluded to were known from those Scriptures by the enemies of Christianity. That other writings of the New Testament are *not mentioned or referred to*, by no means justifies the inference that they were not in existence, but rather that the adversary writing, in his purpose had no occasion to use them. And of that, he was the sole judge. No Christian writer, even, on any occasion whatever, is expected to refer to, or make citations from, all the books of these Scriptures.

5. Celsus, born about A. D. 110, or earlier, and wrote about 150, was the literary champion of those who assailed the Christian religion in their writings. He unintentionally and

inadvertently furnishes an invaluable witness to the sacred writings, as well as their authorship, in his open and active hostility to Christ and Christianity. For he claims to have made these books of the New Testament the exclusive source of his information respecting Jesus and his doctrines. Nevertheless, it is said of Celsus that he took counsel of the Jews of his period, and shared in their prejudice and hate of the Christians and their religion. Be that as it may, it is in evidence throughout his work, Celsus not only assumes, but absolutely affirms and reiterates, that *the disciples of Christ wrote the four Gospels which he takes for his exclusive written authority in opposition*. This fact he constantly exploits. Bishop Westcott justly remarks:

“Celsus quotes the writings of the disciples concerning his life as possessing unquestioned authority; and that these were the four canonical Gospels is proved both by the absence of all evidence to the contrary, and by the special facts which he brings forward. And not only this, but both Celsus and Porphyry appear to have been acquainted with the Pauline Epistles.”⁶⁶

From the use which is made by this adversary of Christianity, it is obvious and evident that these Scriptures were the only books which he relied upon as being authoritative with the Christians. It is easy to prove the identity of the books which he cites with our own canonical Gospels, by an appeal to the facts and doctrines found in their contents. For Celsus is clear and express in terms, tracing the history of Jesus, enlarging upon the capital facts of his life, such as His Nativity, His Baptism, His Ministry, His Miracles, His Death, and His Resurrection, all in exact accordance with our canonical Gospels. Lardner states that there are no less than eighty passages of our Scriptures alluded to and cited by this disbeliever. A limited number of instances, illustrative of the whole, are sufficient to determine the identity of our Gospels in contents with those used by this inveterate enemy. Except in the form

⁶⁶ *Canon of N. T.*, pp. 404, 405.

of citations made at a later date than the writing of the Gospels, these various facts are not found in any work in the world of literature.

§ 408. Internal Evidence.

These facts particularized are :

1. That Jesus descended from the Jewish kings.
2. That his birth was of a virgin mother.
3. That he was born in a village in Judæa.
4. That Joseph was suspicious of Mary's chastity.
5. That at length Mary married the carpenter.
6. That a Star appeared at the time of Christ's birth.
7. That certain Wise Men came to do him homage.
8. That Herod slew young children at Bethlehem.
9. That an Angel directed the flight of the family.
10. That thereupon the family took refuge in Egypt.
11. That finally they returned to their home in Nazareth.
12. That Celsus thence calls Jesus Christ "a Nazarene."
13. That subsequently he underwent the rite of baptism.
14. That the Spirit then descended in the form of a dove.
15. That a Voice also was heard descending from heaven.
16. That Jesus then became known as a public Teacher.
17. That he was Leader in the "sedition from the Jews."
18. That he collected a number of disciples about him.
19. That he healed the lame and blind, and raised the dead
20. That he was really betrayed by one of his disciples.
21. That he was publicly denied by another disciple.
22. That the Jews instigated Christ's condemnation.
23. That he was robed in purple and derided by men.
24. That he was also crowned with thorns and mocked.
25. That he was offered gall and vinegar to drink.
26. That the death of Christ was due to crucifixion.
27. That his disciples at once claimed his resurrection.
28. That a preternatural darkness prevailed at his death.
29. That Celsus refers to the earthquake without denial.
30. That an Angel rolled away the great stone at his tomb.
31. That Jesus showed himself alive after his resurrection.
32. That Jesus Christ was the Founder of Christianity.
33. *That the disciples of Jesus wrote his life in the Gospels,* etc.

Here are no less than thirty-three important facts alluded to in the work of Celsus which he entitled *A True Discourse*,⁶⁷ as quoted by Origen, who refuted him. Very many

⁶⁷ Λόγος Ἀληθής.

other instances of his reference to the sacred books could be adduced, if they were called for. But these substantiate the induction that this adversary was using our Scriptures, and more proof in that direction would be redundant. Nor did Celsus confine himself strictly to the four Gospels; for, as Dr. Lardner remarks:

“Celsus . . . had read, as it seems, all the books of the New Testament, but when he had done that, he supposed that he need not give himself much trouble about any of them, except the historical books, particularly the Gospels.”⁶⁸

It is quite probable that Celsus thought that if he could succeed in destroying the power of Christ's life, the epistolary teachings, which are but expositions of that life, would fall with the Gospels. At any rate, Professor Keim has succeeded in reconstructing the original work of Celsus against the Christians, from the large and exact citations which Origin made in order thoroughly to answer him.⁶⁹

A few decisive cases must stand for the many which prove that *Celsus assumed, asserted, and insisted that the writers of the Gospels were no others than Christ's own disciples.* This proves the authenticity and antiquity of these writings:

§ 409. Authorship of the Four Gospels.

a) *That the disciples of Jesus did record the facts and teachings of his life.*

“Jesus with his own voice expressly declares, as you yourselves have recorded, that there will appear among others, [those] also who will perform miracles.” “He distinctly declares with his own voice, as you yourselves have recorded, that there will come to you, even others employing miracles.”⁷⁰

β) *That the disciples wrote the Gospels to relieve Jesus of certain charges.*

“The disciples of Jesus wrote such accounts regarding him by way of extenuating the charges which told against him.”⁷¹

γ) *That Celsus himself used these Books as being unquestionably authoritative.*

⁶⁸ Lard. vii, 263.

⁷⁰ Origen contra Celsum, ii, 58, 49.

⁶⁹ Schaff, *Person of Christ*, p. 199, n.

⁷¹ *Ib.* ii, 16.

"All these statements are taken from your own books, in addition to which we need no other witness; you fall by your own swords."⁷²

δ) *That certain heretics had effected alterations in the text of the Gospels.*

"That certain of the Christian believers, . . . having corrupted the Gospels from their original integrity, to a threefold, and fourfold, and many-fold degree, and having remodeled it, so that they might be able to answer objections,"⁷³ etc.

ε) *Celsus claims that he suppressed some things he knew derogatory of Jesus.*

"I could say many things concerning the affairs of Jesus, and those too true, different from those written by the disciples of Jesus. But I purposely omit them."⁷⁴

So far Celsus. This shrewd and keen antagonist of the Christians admits incontestably, and even directly ascribes the writing of these books of the New Testament to the disciples of Christ, and to no others, relying upon these writings as his sole authority for both friends and foes, wherewith to assail the Christian religion and refute the Christians. There is no evidence that any person at that time believed any otherwise. The rankest disbeliever of his period did not attempt to dispute the authorship of these writings, which he himself possessed, and had evidently studied with the greatest care. *Thus upon the witness of one who was the champion of the enemies of Christianity, the authenticity and antiquity of the sacred books are placed beyond recall.* For, as remarked by the famous Chrysostom: "Celsus and Bataneotes [*i. e.*, Porphyry] are sufficient witnesses to the antiquity of our books; for I presume they did not oppose writings which had been published since their own time."⁷⁵ They lived within a century of the publication of these sacred books, and were in a position to know what they were writing about, quite as well as one living two thousand years afterwards. It is a very remarkable circumstance that after having named about all the main

⁷² *Origen contra Celsum*, ii, 74.

⁷⁴ *Ib.* ii, 13.

⁷³ *Ib.* ii, 27.

⁷⁵ *Chrys. Homily vi*, on 1 Cor.

facts which occurred in our Lord's life, from his Nativity to his resurrection, Celsus affirms and reiterates these propositions:

1. "Jesus . . . declares as you yourselves have recorded."
2. "The disciples of Jesus wrote such accounts regarding him."
3. "All these statements are taken from your own books."
4. "Certain . . . Christian believers . . . corrupted the Gospels from their original integrity."
5. "I could say many things concerning the affairs of Jesus . . . different from those written by the disciples of Jesus."

The charge of Celsus that certain believers had corrupted the Gospels of their original integrity is quite true. Near the middle of the second century, Cerinthus, Valentius, and Marcion, and others who were denounced as heretics in consequence, did mutilate these Scriptures to adapt them to their own preconceived notions of how they should read and what they should teach; and this high-handed procedure aroused the just indignation of the Church, and called forth protests and condemnation from Justin Martyr, Tertullian, and other defenders of the faith. *But all this distinctly proves that there were "written books" existing at that time to corrupt, and such as had "their original integrity," which was liable to be corrupted.* But not all nor most of these Scriptures, by any means, underwent this mutilation and corruption. But the *uncorrupted* manuscripts and versions which have come down to us prove the identity of the Scriptures used by Celsus with our own, by his numerous citations. This adversary makes "plain references to Matthew, Luke, and John, and probably Mark also;" and he refers to several of Paul's Epistles, if not to the Epistles of St. Peter and St. John.⁷⁶ And, without exception, all these writings are attributed to apostolic writers.

6. Tacitus, born A. D. 61 or earlier, and wrote in the first decade of the second century or before. This man of fame is adduced as a witness respecting a single fact which is fundamental to the authenticity of these sacred books and to the whole system of Christianity. Very high authority represents

⁷⁶ Dr. Lardner, vii, 223, 224.

Tacitus as “the famous Roman historian who ranks beyond dispute *in the highest place among men of letters of all ages*, who lived in the latter half of the first, and in the early part of the second, century of our era.” In the reference which this historian makes to the great conflagration which nearly consumed all Rome in A. D. 54, ordered by the Emperor Nero, who laid his own crime upon the defenseless Christians that he might escape the terrible indignation and vengeance of an infuriated populace, Tacitus mentions “the persons commonly called Christians;” and that “Christ, the Founder of that name was put to death as a criminal by Pontius Pilate, procurator of Judæa, in the reign of Tiberius” [Cæsar].”

Respecting the character and credibility of this brief paragraph, the celebrated author of the *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, Edward Gibbon, one of the worst enemies of Christianity in his century, thus attests:

“The most skeptical criticism is obliged to respect *the truth* of this extraordinary fact, and *the integrity* of this celebrated passage of Tacitus. The former [the truth] is confirmed by the diligent and accurate Suetonius, who mentions the punishment which Nero inflicted on the Christians, a sect of men who had embraced ‘a new and criminal superstition.’ The latter [the integrity] may be proved by the consent of the most ancient manuscripts; by the inimitable character of the style of Tacitus; by his reputation, which guarded his text from the interpolations of pious frauds,”⁷⁸ etc.

What fact or facts attested by Tacitus, and unqualifiedly indorsed by Gibbon, are here brought to view? These, namely:

1. The historical existence of Jesus Christ whom Tacitus names.
2. That Jesus was known and named as the Founder of the Christian religion.
3. That he was supposed to have been executed in the character of a criminal.
4. That he was put to death by the Roman officer, Pontius Pilate.
5. That Pilate was at that time the procurator of the Province Judæa.
6. That the death of Jesus Christ occurred in the reign of Tiberius.
7. That Christ had disciples in “the persons commonly called Christians.”

⁷⁷ *Annals*, xv, 44.

⁷⁸ Vol. I, p. 602.

Now, it is perfectly evident from this testimony of Tacitus, giving these cardinal facts, that the narrative of Christ's earthly life was no myth; for all the characteristics of history blend in this one remarkable attestation: the personal subject, Christ; his work, the Founder of Christianity; the peculiarity of his death, as a criminal; the name of the ruler who sentenced him, Pilate; the character of his Roman office, procurator; the province where it occurred, Judæa; the time when he was executed, in the reign of Tiberius; the sect that assumed Christ's name, the Christians. These facts so distinctly stated by this eminent Roman historian are perfectly consistent with each other, and are in exact accord with the statements given in the Gospels respecting Christ's death. And since books which narrate facts are declared to be historical, these books of the New Testament are historical. Tacitus was the contemporary of the Apostle John; so this writer stands within the Apostolic Age.

The testimony of the last of the adverse witnesses is that of

7. Josephus, the Jewish priest and historian, born near the time of the crucifixion, in A. D. 37. His work, entitled *Jewish Antiquities*,* contains ten facts in one paragraph, all which are found in the historical New Testament.⁷⁹ He says:

“Now there was about this time a wise man, if it be lawful to call him a man; for he was a doer of wonderful works; a teacher of such as receive the truth with pleasure. He drew over to him both many of the Jews, and many of the Gentiles. He was the Christ. And when Pilate, at the suggestion of the principal men amongst us, had condemned him to the cross, those that loved him did not forsake him; for he appeared to them alive again on the third day, as the divine prophets had foretold these and ten thousand other wonderful things concerning him; and the sect of Christians so named from him, are not extinct at this day.”

II.

The second line of testimony is that of friends of Christianity, in order to *confirm* the witness of the enemies relating to the historicity of the facts and statements contained in the

*On genuineness of this paragraph, see *Excursus A.*

⁷⁹*Ant. B. xviii, c. 3. §3.*

sacred books now under discussion. It will embrace three classes of patristic evidence; namely, ancient bishops, the Apostolic Fathers, or disciples of the apostles, and the Christian Apologists.

§ 410. Con-
firmed by
Friends.

8. Origen, born at Alexandria, A. D. 185, and wrote by or before 254. Eusebius, in his *Ecclesiastical History*, makes the following citation from Origen:

a) "These are the books which he mentions. . . . He attests that he knows only four Gospels, . . . which are the only undisputed ones in the whole Church throughout the world. The first was written according to Matthew; the same who was once a publican, but afterward an apostle of Jesus Christ, who having published it for the Jewish converts, wrote it in Hebrew. The second [Gospel] is according to Mark, who composed it as Peter explained it to him. And the third [Gospel] according to Luke, the Gospel commended by Paul, which was written for the converts of the Gentiles; and, last of all, the Gospel according to John."⁸⁰

β) The question is critically asked: Why did not the several writers of the four Gospels add their *signatures* to their writings to substantiate their genuineness and authenticity? The sufficient answer is, that these points were substantiated in another and better way. Chrysostom, Bishop of Constantinople (347-407), says:

"Moses did not put his name to the five books; nor did the historians who wrote after him, prefix their names to their writings; but the blessed Paul everywhere prefixes his name to his Epistles, excepting to that of the Hebrews, where he had reason to be on his reserve. What is the reason of this? *They [the Evangelists] delivered their writings to those who were present, when it was needless to put down the name. He [Paul] sent his writings to those who were at a distance in the form of an Epistle, where the addition of a name is necessary.*"⁸¹

So direct and personal was this method of authenticating the apostolicity of these historical books of the New Testament, that these documents were regarded as incontestable, and therefore were never held in dispute in the Church.

γ) Origen further mentions the three Epistles of John, two

⁸⁰ Book vi, 25.

⁸¹ *Hom. on Rom.* B. 9.

by Peter, the first of which was undisputed, but of the second Epistle there was some doubt; also the Apocalypse, and the Epistle to the Hebrews. Of this last Epistle Origen says:

“It differs from Paul’s style; is written in purer Greek;” but “the ideas are admirable, and not inferior to any of the books acknowledged to be apostolic.” “But I would say that the thoughts are the apostle’s, but the diction and the phraseology belong to one who recorded what the apostle said, as one noted down what the Master dictated. But who it was that really wrote the Epistle, God only knows.”⁸²

δ) Obviously, to be able to name the writer of a given document is so far satisfactory; but it does not prove that the document is inspired of God, or even that its contents are authentic. Such claims rest upon more solid grounds than a writer’s signature. There is, indeed, no warrant for believing that the apostles were acting under that supernatural inspiration known as *theopneustia*, in their daily life and conduct; *but merely when engaged in the work of their apostolate.*⁸³ Authorship, then, is one thing, and inspiration is another. For the foregoing reason, given by Chrysostom, Paul took special care to authenticate his own writings to the several Churches or the individual addressed. Some, if not all, his apostolic Epistles were circular letters; a circumstance which necessitated the more attention respecting the authentic evidence of his apostolic authorship. He seems to have posited his autograph and “token” with the several Churches to which he wrote, in order to detect certain spurious letters circulated at that time, in the names of the apostles. Hence he wrote:

“Paul an apostle . . . unto the Churches of Galatia.”⁸⁴ And again: “When this Epistle is read among you, cause it to be read in the church of the Laodiceans; and that ye likewise read the Epistle from Laodicea.”⁸⁵ “The salutation of Paul with mine own hand, which is the token in every Epistle. So I write.”⁸⁶

⁸² Eusebius, *E. H.*, vi, c. 25.

⁸³ See Acts xvi, 7, 9; xv, 37-39; Gal. ii, 11-13.

⁸⁴ Gal. i, 2.

⁸⁵ Col. iv, 16.

⁸⁶ 2 Thess, iii, 17, comp. 1 Cor. xvi, 21; Col. iv, 18; Gal. vi, 11.

ε) *The Muratorian Canon*, dating A. D. 170. This document of recent discovery gives a peculiarly interesting account of the origin of John's Gospel. Professor Brooke Foss Westcott, of Cambridge University,⁸⁷ England, makes the following statement respecting it:

§ 411. The Fourth Gospel.

"The fragment commences with the last words of a sentence which evidently referred to the Gospel of St. Mark. The Gospel of St. Luke, it is then said, stands third in order [in the Canon], having been written by Luke the physician, the companion of St. Paul, who, not being himself an eye-witness, based his narrative on such information as he could obtain, beginning from the birth of John. The fourth place is given to the Gospel of St. John, 'a disciple of the Lord,' and the occasion of its composition is thus described: 'At the entreaties of his fellow-disciples and his bishops, John said: Fast with me for three days from this time, and whatever shall be revealed to each of us [whether it be favorable to my writing or not] let us relate it to one another: On the same night it was revealed to Andrew, one of the apostles, that John should relate all things in his own name, aided by the revision of all. . . . What wonder is it, then, that John brings forward each detail with so much emphasis, even in his Epistles, saying of himself, *What we have seen with our eyes, and heard with our ears, and our hands have handled, these things have we written to you.* For so he professes that he was not only an eye-witness, but a hearer, and, moreover, an historian of all the wonderful works of the Lord in order.'"

The assistance rendered to John by the other apostles, here referred to, serves to explain a single sentence which otherwise seems disconnected and inexplicable. It is at the close of the Gospel, and reads as the indorsement of the revisionists should read, respecting the authenticity of John's Gospel; namely, "This is that disciple who testifieth these things, and wrote these things; and we know that his testimony is true."⁸⁸

Irenæus, Bishop of Lyons, who was the disciple of Polycarp, who was the disciple of the Apostle John, wrote: "John the disciple of the Lord, the same that lay upon his bosom, also published the Gospel while he was yet at Ephesus in Asia."⁸⁹

⁸⁷ *Canon of the New Testament*, 5th ed., p. 214.

⁸⁸ John xxi, 24. ⁸⁹ *Euseb. E. H.* v, c. 8, p. 176.

Clement of Alexandria, who wrote in the second century, is the authority for the tradition from the apostles :

“John, the last of all [the Evangelists], perceiving that what had reference to the body of our Savior was sufficiently detailed [in the other three Gospels which he had read], and being encouraged by his familiar friends, and urged by the Spirit, wrote a spiritual Gospel.”⁹⁰

To which Eusebius himself adds: “But he [John] commenced with the doctrine of the *Divinity* [of Christ] as the part reserved for him by the Divine Spirit, as for a superior.”⁹¹

9. Tertullian, of Carthage, the learned juriconsult and eminent defender of the faith, born A. D. 150, and flourished in the close of the second century, wrote :

“The Gospel of Luke, which we are defending [against the heretic Marcion] with all our might, has stood its ground from its very first publication;” “while that which Mark published may be affirmed to be Peter’s, whose interpreter Mark was. For even Luke’s form of the Gospel men usually ascribe to Paul. And it may well seem that the works which the disciples published, belong to their Masters.” “On the whole, then, if that is evidently the more true which is earlier; if that is earlier which is from the beginning; if that is from the beginning which has the apostles for its authors—then it will certainly be quite evident that that comes down from the apostles, which has been kept as a sacred deposit in the Churches of the apostles. Let us see what ‘milk’ the Corinthians drank from Paul; to what rule of ‘faith’ the Galatians were brought for correction; what the Philippians, the Thessalonians, the Ephesians read by it; what utterances also the Romans give who are nearest to us, to whom Peter and Paul conjointly bequeathed the Gospel, even sealed with their blood. We have also John’s foster Churches [viz., the seven Churches of Asia].”⁹²

An analysis of Tertullian’s testimony written about one hundred and thirty-five years after the publication of the Gospels, yields the following facts :

1. Even with heretics, Luke’s Gospel had an undisputed credit from the beginning.
2. Mark’s Gospel was considered as the substance of Peter’s preaching at Rome.
3. The four Evangelists are correctly named; John is identified with “the Churches in Asia.”

⁹⁰ *Euseb. E. H.* vi, 14.

⁹¹ *Ib.* iii, 24.

⁹² *Against Marcion*, iv, 5.

4. Six Pauline Epistles, as addressed to Churches, are here mentioned by Tertullian.
5. He affirms that writings "from the beginning had the apostles for their authors."
6. That these had been "kept as a sacred deposit in the Churches of the apostles."*

10. Irenaeus, born A. D. 115–125, was a Smyranean, who was at but one remove from the instructions of the Apostle John. He became Bishop of Lyons in 178. He calls the books of the New Testament "*the Sacred Scriptures*" and "*the Oracles of God*."⁹³ Then he makes this attestation:

"We have not received the knowledge of the way of salvation by any others than from those through whom the Gospel has come down to us; which Gospel they first preached, and afterward, by the will of God, transmitted in writing, that it might be the foundation and pillar of our faith. . . . After our Lord had risen from the dead, and they were clothed with the power of the Holy Spirit, . . . they went forth to the ends of the earth, spreading the glad tidings of the blessings which God conferred on us, announcing peace from heaven to men, having all and every one alike the Gospel of God.

"*Matthew also issued a written Gospel among the Hebrews in their own dialect, while Peter and Paul were preaching at Rome, and laying the foundation of the Church. And after their departure [from earth], Mark, the disciple and interpreter of Peter, did also hand down to us in writing what had been preached by Peter. Luke, also, the companion of Paul, recorded in a book, the Gospel preached by him. Afterwards John, the disciple of the Lord, who also leaned upon his breast, did himself publish a Gospel, during his residence in Asia.*"⁹⁴ "The Church, though dispersed throughout the earth, received from the apostles and their

* Simon Greenleaf on the *Law of Evidence*, 15th ed., Vol. I, § 142.

"Documents found in a place in which, and under the care of persons with whom, such papers might naturally and reasonably be expected to be found, or in the possession of persons having an interest in them, are in precisely the custody which gives authenticity to documents found within it."

Note.—"The rule stated in the text is one of the grounds on which we insist on the genuineness of the books of the Holy Scriptures. They are found in the proper custody or place, where alone they ought to be looked for; namely, the Church, where they have been kept from time immemorial. They have been constantly referred to as the foundation of faith by all the opposing sects, whose existence God in his wisdom has seen fit to permit, whose jealous vigilance would readily detect any attempt to falsify the text, and whose diversity of creeds would render any mutual combination morally impossible."

⁹³ *Adv. Heresies*, B. i, 8; ii, c. 27.

⁹⁴ Eusebius, *Eccles. Hist.* c. 8, p. 176; *Iren. adv. Heresies*, B. iii, c. 1.

disciples this faith.”⁹⁵ “The Gospel [itself] and all the elders witness, who in Asia conferred with John the Lord’s disciple, to the effect that John delivered these things unto them; for he abode until the times of Trajan [A. D. 98–117]. And some of them saw not only John, but others of the apostles also, and had this same account from them, and witness to the aforesaid account.”⁹⁶

Clement of Alexandria gives a brief testimony respecting the origin of the Gospel by Mark. He says:

“When Peter had proclaimed the word publicly at Rome, and declared the Gospel under the influence of the Spirit, as there was a great number present, they requested Mark, who had followed him from afar, and remembered well what he said, *to reduce those things to writing*; and that after *composing the Gospel, he gave it to them who requested it of him*. Which, when Peter understood, he directly neither hindered nor encouraged it.”⁹⁷

The substance of these several testimonies is to this effect: that *the Gospels were written by the apostles of Jesus*; that they *were transmitted* by the writers to the Church throughout the whole world; that the Church receiving them were the proper custodians of the Sacred Books; and that the witness of Celsus, the champion of disbelief, stands *confirmed* in his affirmation of the authorship of the Gospels, by his Christian contemporaries in the middle of the second century; namely, by Tertullian, Irenæus, and Clement of Alexandria, all of whom lived within eighty-five years of the publication of the Gospels.

§ 412. A Comparative Summary.

i. A comparative view of their testimonies is conclusive that *written Gospels were historically existent*, and in wide circulation, long before the middle of the second century.

1. Irenæus testifies to the names of the four Evangelists as known as the writers of the four Gospels, who are mentioned in their proper order as we now have them.

2. Irenæus affirms the first of the following propositions:

a) That “Matthew issued a *written Gospel* among the Hebrews in their own dialect.” Celsus says: “*The disciples of Jesus wrote such accounts regarding him.*”

⁹⁵ *Ant. Fathers, Iren. vs. Heresies*, c. 10, B. 1.

⁹⁶ See Bp. Lightfoot’s *Apos. Fathers* on Iren. ii, 22. 5, Fragment iv, p. 554.

⁹⁷ “Hypotyposes,” cited by Eusebius, *Eccl. Hist.*, B. vi, c. 14.

β) That "Mark handed down to us, *in writing*, what had been preached by Peter." Clement says: "Mark . . . *reduced those things to writing*; and after *composing the Gospel*, he gave it to those who had requested it of him."

γ) That "Luke recorded in a book the Gospel preached by Paul." Tertullian says: "The Gospel of Luke has stood its ground from its very first publication." Celsus says that he could relate "things different from those *written by the disciples of Jesus*."

δ) That "John, the disciple of the Lord, who leaned upon his breast, *did himself publish a Gospel*, during his residence in Ephesus, in Asia." And Celsus, having cited from each Gospel, says: "All these things are taken *from your own books*, in addition to which we need no other witness."

ii. The *transmission, reception, and custody* of the Sacred Books are thus substantiated with reference to the Church :

3. Irenæus says: "Which Gospel they first preached, and afterwards *transmitted in writing*, that it might be the foundation and pillar of the Faith;" that "the Church, though dispersed throughout the earth, *received from the apostles and their disciples, this faith*." Clement says that "Mark, after composing the Gospel, *gave it to them that requested it of him*." Irenæus says specifically of John's Gospel: "The Gospel [itself] and all the elders witness who in Asia conferred with John, the Lord's disciple, to the effect that John had delivered these things unto them; for he abode until the times of Trajan. And some of them saw not only John, but others of the apostles also, and had this same account from them; and *witness to the aforesaid account* [of the correctness of John's Gospel]."

By another movement upward in chronology we have a witness who was born in the first century [A. D. 89], and was living before the Apostle John died, whose testimony is of paramount importance as respects the existence of *the Gospel in written form*, at that date.

11. Justin, surnamed *the Martyr*, a philosopher, and the most eminent Greek Apologist of his century, a Samaritan by birth, born at Shechem, now called Nablous, in Central Palestine. He was remarkable for his memory, his wide reading, and great learning. An undisputed authority states that "he cites our present canon, and particularly our four Gospels continually, . . . about two hundred times."⁹⁸ His references

⁹⁸Jones, *New and Full Method*, 1, 589.

to and citations from the Gospels alone number one hundred and twenty instances. In his *First Apology* he makes nearly *fifty* allusions and quotations from the New Testament, and in his *Dialogue with Trypho* he makes about seventy more.

But that which is of special importance is that designation which he applies to the four Gospels referring to their authorship, as *The Memoirs of the Apostles*, or in respect to their contents, *Memoirs*, and *Memorabilia*.⁹⁹ In his *Dialogue*, he calls the Gospels *Memoirs* four times, and *Memoirs of the Apostles* ten times. A few instances are sufficient to illustrate the fact:

1. "A Star arose in the heavens at the time of his birth, as is recorded in the *Memoirs of His Apostles*."¹⁰⁰

2. "They parted my garments and cast lots upon my vesture, . . . and this is recorded to have happened [unto Jesus] in the *Memoirs of His Apostles*."¹⁰¹

3. "As those having written *Memoirs* touching all things concerning our Savior Jesus Christ taught, whom we believe."¹⁰²

4. "For the apostles in the *Memoirs* composed by them, which are called *Gospels*, have delivered unto us, what was enjoined upon them."¹⁰³

5. "In the *Memoirs*, which I affirm were drawn up by his apostles, and those that accompanied them, that his sweat fell down like drops of blood, while he was praying."¹⁰⁴

Professor Andrews Norton, in his famous work, says:

"From the works of Justin might be extracted a brief account of the life and doctrine of Christ, corresponding with that contained in the Gospels, and corresponding to that degree, both in matter and words, that almost every quotation and reference may be readily assigned to its proper place, in one or the other of the Gospels."¹⁰⁵

Having made specific citations and repeated references to each of the four Gospels, Justin further alludes to and cites from Acts, Romans, the Corinthians, Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, Second Thessalonians, Hebrews, Second Epistle of Peter, and the Book of Revelation.

⁹⁹ Τὰ ἀπομνημόνευματα, = things worthy of remembrance.

¹⁰⁰ *Dialogue with Trypho*, 106.

¹⁰¹ *Dialogue*, 104.

¹⁰² *First Apology*, 33.

¹⁰³ *Ib.* 66.

¹⁰⁴ *Dialogue*, 103.

¹⁰⁵ *Genuineness of the Gospels*, Vol. I, p. 127, 2d edition.

12. Papias, who seems to have been born in the first century, was Bishop of Hierapolis in Phrygia, whom Irenæus mentions as “a hearer of John [the apostle] and the associate of Polycarp.” His only work was entitled, *An Exposition of the Discourses of the Lord*,¹⁰⁶ of which about fifteen fragments remain. Papias says:

“Matthew composed his history in the Hebrew dialect, and every one translated it as he was able.” “Mark being the interpreter of Peter [into the Greek], whatsoever he recorded he wrote with great accuracy, but not in the order in which it was spoken or done by our Lord; for he never heard nor followed the Lord; but . . . he was in company with Peter who gave him such instruction as was necessary, but not to give a history of our Lord’s discourses. Wherefore Mark has not erred in anything by writing some things as he has recorded them, for he was carefully attentive to one thing; [viz.,] not to pass by anything he heard, or to state anything falsely in these accounts.” There are also other “testimonies from the First Epistle of John, and likewise that from Peter.”¹⁰⁷

Another upward movement of about seventy-five years brings us completely within the Apostolic Age, and to the testimony of two persons of distinction who were the converts and companions of the apostles themselves. They are known as *the Apostolic Fathers*; the Fathers who were the immediate pupils of the apostles.

13. Clement of Rome, of whom Paul wrote to the Philippians: “Help those women who labored with me in the gospel, with *Clement also*, . . . whose names are in the *Book of Life*.”¹⁰⁸ Irenæus wrote of Clement: “This man as he had seen the blessed apostles, and had been conversant with them, might be said to have the preaching of the apostles still echoing [in his soul].”¹⁰⁹

Clement was Bishop of Rome A. D. 93–101. He wrote but one Epistle, which had for its object to compose a feud in the Church at Corinth. In this Epistle he cites the four Gospels, Acts, Romans, Corinthians, Ephesians, First Epistle of

¹⁰⁶ Λογίων Κυριακῶν ἑξήγησις.

¹⁰⁷ *Euseb. E. H.*, B. iii, c. 39, pp. 115, 116. See Bishop Lightfoot’s *Apos. Fath.*, p. 529.

¹⁰⁸ *Phil.* iv, 3. ¹⁰⁹ *Adv. Heresies*, iii, c. 3, § 3.

Timothy, Titus, Hebrews, First Epistle of Peter, the Epistle of James, and the Book of Revelation; making fourteen in all. There are no less than seventy-three references and citations in this Epistle. Here is one reference:

“Take in your hands the Epistle of the blessed Paul [to you Corinthians]. What wrote he unto you in the beginning of the Gospel? Of a truth he charged you in the Spirit concerning himself and Cephas and Apollos; because even then ye had made parties,”¹¹⁰ etc.

14. Barnabas (70-79). The common consensus of the latest critical scholarship refuses to identify this man with Barnabas the Apostle, a Levite of Cyprus, who was the companion of Paul in his missionary journey into Asia Minor. He seems to have been a layman, and his Epistle is general in object and character, in opposition to the Judaizing teachers of that period. The document was written in Greek and attached to the famous Greek manuscript of the New Testament found by Dr. Tischendorf in the convent of St. Catherine, at Mount Sinai, in 1859, and published in 1862. It is obvious from this Epistle that the three Synoptic Gospels, the Epistle to the Romans, the two to the Corinthians, Philippians, the Second to Timothy, and the Second of Peter, and the Apocalypse, were all in circulation at that time, which was within from five to fifteen years of the publication of the Gospels. The contents of this Epistle furnish three lines of evidence touching the point under discussion, namely:

1. Conspicuous Facts and Occurrences mentioned in the Gospels.
2. Quotations and References to the Substances of the Scriptures.
3. A direct citation under the formula, “*As it is written.*”

Of the Facts and Occurrences, a few instances are given to illustrate the proposition:

1. The mentioning of Jesus Christ by name.¹¹¹
2. Choice, Number, and Authority of Christ’s Apostles.¹¹²
3. Miracles wrought in Christ’s Ministry.¹¹³
4. The peculiar Sufferings which he endured.¹¹⁴

¹¹⁰ *Epis.* c. 47.
¹¹³ *Ib.* 5.

¹¹¹ *Epis. of Barnabas*, cc. 2, 7-9.
¹¹⁴ *Ib.* 5, 7.

¹¹² *Ib.* cc. 5, 8

5. The Spitting upon, and Smiting of his Person.¹¹⁵
6. The Mockery of Herod with the Scarlet Robe.¹¹⁶
7. The putting of Christ to death by Crucifixion.¹¹⁷
8. Giving him Vinegar and Gall to drink.¹¹⁸
9. The Casting of Lots for his Garments before the Cross.¹¹⁹
10. His Resurrection on the Third Day.¹²⁰
11. Its Celebration on the Eighth Day.¹²¹
12. The Ascension of Jesus into Heaven.¹²²

A few illustrations of the References and Quotations of Scripture must answer:

“Thou shalt not hesitate to give.”¹²³ “He came not to call the righteous, but sinners.”¹²⁴ “The Son of God being Lord, and future Judge of the quick and dead.”¹²⁵ “By receiving the remission of our sins . . . we are become new, created afresh from the beginning.”¹²⁶ “The glory of Jesus, how that in him, and unto him are all things.”¹²⁷ “He himself endured that he might destroy death.”¹²⁸ “The day of the Lord shall be as a thousand years.”¹²⁹

Barnabas quotes the words of Jesus occurring in the first Gospel, under the formula “*As it hath been written*,” “For many are called, but few chosen.”¹³⁰ These words of Jesus appear in Matthew’s Gospel, and nowhere else in Scripture.¹³¹ The Epistle of Barnabas reads: “Let us take heed, lest haply we be found, *as it hath been written*.¹³² *Many are called, but few chosen.*” The words in the original of the Epistle of Barnabas and of the Greek Testament are the same,¹³³ as they are also in the English. The Latin version is ambiguous when taken by itself;¹³⁴ while in the Greek the expression is entirely clear and determinate.

The argument in which all these details converge is the conclusive one that the Church from the hands of the apostles has always been in possession of the apostolic Scriptures. It was not a mere oral or traditional Gospel whose teachings

¹¹⁵ *Epis. of Barnabas*, 5, 7. ¹¹⁶ *Ib.* 7. ¹¹⁷ *Ib.* 7. ¹¹⁸ *Ib.* 7. ¹¹⁹ *Ib.* 6.

¹²⁰ *Ib.* 5, 15. ¹²¹ *Ib.* 15. ¹²² *Ib.* 15. ¹²³ *Ib.* 19; *Matt.* v, 42. ¹²⁴ *Ib.* 5; *Mark* ii, 17.

¹²⁵ *Ib.* 7; *Acts* x, 42. ¹²⁶ *Ib.* 16; *2 Cor.* v, 17. ¹²⁷ *Ib.* 12; *Rom.* xi, 36.

¹²⁸ *Ib.* 5; *1 Cor.* xv, 26. ¹²⁹ *Ib.* 15; *2 Pet.* iii, 8.

¹³⁰ *Ib.* 4, close. ¹³¹ *Matt.* xx, 16; *xxii*, 14, in *A. V.*

¹³² *Ὡς γέγραπται.*

¹³³ Πολλοὶ κλητοὶ ὀλίγοι, δὲ ἐκλεκτοὶ

¹³⁴ *Sicum scriptum est.*

governed the life of the primitive Christians, but they held in their hands and studied *the written books of the New Testament*. On such evidence, it is obviously irrational to hold that these Sacred Books did not have an historical existence during the first three hundred years of the Christian era, and that the contents of the books were not historical. For it is irrational to maintain on any historical grounds or questions, that so many different writers could state so many circumstances as are recorded in these Scriptures, when no such facts ever occurred, and no such Scriptures then existed. It is irrational to believe that so many adversaries could name so many apostolic writers, could describe so many apostolic acts, and would ascribe the accounts of these acts to certain sacred books, but the books did not exist until long afterwards. It is as irrational as it is absurd to believe that the enemies of Christianity do *not confirm* and authenticate these Scriptures, when constantly referring to these writings they make the distinct affirmation: "*All these statements are taken from your own books,*" "*as you yourselves have recorded*" them. And it is as irrational as it is incredible to hold that the apostolic authors did *not write* these books ascribed to them, when, without a single exception, friends and foes unanimously voice the first four centuries with the imputation and declaration that they did! The evidence adduced substantiates beyond recall the historicity of the Scriptures of the New Testament; for the *catena* of proofs is complete respecting the authorship, as well as the antiquity and authenticity of these Scriptures.

It is the wise and forcible remark of the scholarly and critical Dr. Ezra Abbot which is indorsed by Professor Norton respecting the Christian witnesses here adduced, that—

"It is not [merely] the testimony of a few eminent Christian writers to their private opinion, but it is the evidence they afford of the belief of the whole body of Christians; and this not in respect to ordinary books, whose titles they might easily take on trust, but respecting books in which they were most deeply interested; books which were the very foundation of that faith which had separated them from the world

around them, exposed them to hatred, scorn, and persecution, and often demanded the sacrifice of life itself." ¹³⁵

That which is of paramount importance in this argument is the admissions and claims made by the adversaries of the Christian religion in respect to the fundamental facts respecting the life, death, and the work of the historical Christ. On these very facts rest the whole system of Christianity. Next in evidential value is the distinct implication, or assertion, that the disciples of Jesus wrote the books of the New Testament which they constantly cite, or to whose contents they refer. An added fact is, that their testimony mentions correctly by name five of the seven or eight writers of these Scriptures, and designates what they wrote. This voluntary witness of those adverse to Christianity stands absolutely confirmed on the main facts and many minor circumstances, by the testimony of the Christian Fathers. These writers are not merely a few isolated individuals who stand along the centuries apart from the communities in which they lived, but men of highest character among their contemporaries, voicing the universal judgment of the Church as it has been from the beginning. Here are mentioned cities unto whose people these Epistles were addressed, the names of the apostles who were the writers of these Epistles, and the different Churches which were made the depositories of these Epistles. By the rules of evidence applying alike to historical documents, whether secular or sacred in character, these apostolic books were kept in the proper custody to insure their authenticity.

III.

Destructive critics have laid great stress upon *the titles* which are prefixed to the several historical books of the New Testament. It has even been suggested that the Christian faith originated in, and was formulated by, the titles superscribed, as the exclusive evi-

§ 413. Review
of the
Evidence.

§ 414. Some
Collateral
Evidence.

¹³⁵ *Authorship of the Fourth Gospel*, first edition, p. 14.

dence of credibility. Dr. David Strauss went so far as to insist, that "the alleged ocular testimony is sheer assumption, originating from the titles which the Biblical books bear in the Canon."¹³⁶ But, in turn, this is sheer assumption, and destitute of proof. It is a well-ascertained fact, however, that these titles are very ancient, as they are found on some of the earliest Greek manuscripts extant. But it does not appear that they were placed by the apostolic authors upon *the original autographs*. Nor is it known when or by whom these superscriptions were prefixed, but they clearly antedate the great Councils of the Church. It is, however, most natural to suppose that they were originally placed upon these documents by those receiving them, to whom they came authenticated, in order to distinguish one book from another. Some special minute was necessitated to preserve the authenticated authorships from running into confusion. Tertullian censures Marcion's mutilated Gospel for the omission of its title, insisting that "A work ought not to be recognized . . . which gives no promise of credibility from the *fullness of the title*."¹³⁷ Several different *versions* which are among the earliest, and long antedate the most ancient Greek manuscripts, have *distinguishing titles* of the First Gospel. Thus the *Syriac* has: "*The Gospel, the Preaching of Matthew*." In the *Persian* it reads: "*The Gospel of Matthew which was spoken in the Hebrew tongue in the City of Palestine, but written in Syriac*." In the *Arabic*: "*The Gospel of Saint Matthew which he wrote in Hebrew, by the inspiration of the Holy Spirit*."¹³⁸

Next to the peculiar *age-coloring* of an ancient document, one of the most reliable proofs of its antiquity and authenticity is the use made of it in citations, made by contemporaries and their successors, especially when the authorship is accredited. As they know their authority, this is decisive against the spuriousness of the writ-

§415. Citations
as
Evidence.

¹³⁶ *Leben Jesu*, § 13.

¹³⁷ *Tertull. adv. Marcion*, iv, c. 2.

¹³⁸ *Horne's Introduction*, American Edition, Vol. I, 215; II, 295, 296.

ing; and they could not quote from writers who lived after themselves. In all respects, the books of the New Testament have the advantage of incomparable superiority over all classic writers known. Dr. Lardner, who was a famous investigator on all lines respecting the books of the New Testament, says:

“We have seen and examined a large number of works of learned Christian writers in Palestine, Syria, the countries of Asia Minor, Egypt, and that part of Africa that used the Latin tongue, and in Crete, Greece, Italy and Gaul; all [written] in the space of about one hundred and fifty years after the writing of the first book of the New Testament. In the remaining works of Irenæus, Clement of Alexandria, and Tertullian . . . there are perhaps more and larger quotations of the *New Testament* than of all the works of Cicero.” “The facts upon which the Christian religion is founded, have made a stronger proof than any facts at such a distance of time; and the books which convey them down to us may be proved to be uncorrupted and authentic, with greater strength than any other writings of equal antiquity.”¹³⁹

Mr. Rawlinson, in his *Bampton Lectures*, already cited, makes some very pertinent remarks on the point of quotations and their authenticating force, in a comparison of these Scriptures and the writings of classical authors. He says:

“Before the *titles* were attached, the belief must have existed [in their authenticity]. In truth, *there is not the slightest pretense for insinuating that there ever was any doubt as to the authorship of any one of the historical books of the New Testament, which are as uniformly ascribed to the writers whose names they bear, as the ‘Return of the Ten Thousand’ [ascribed] to Xenophon, or the ‘Lives of the Cæsars’ to Suetonius. There is, indeed, far better evidence of authorship in the case of the four Gospels and Acts of the Apostles than exists with respect to the works of almost any classic author. It is of very rare occurrence for classic works to be distinctly quoted, or for authors to be mentioned by name, within a century of their publication. The Gospels . . . are frequently quoted within this period, and the writers of three at least out of the four are mentioned within the time, as authors of the works correspondingly perfect to those which have come down to us as their compositions. Our conviction of the genuineness of the Gospels does not rest exclusively, nor even mainly, on the titles, but on the unanimous consent of ancient writers, and of the whole Christian Church in the first ages.*”¹⁴⁰

Test the matter by a few instances of conspicuous character. Herodotus, who lived B. C. 484–408, and has been called “the

¹³⁹Lardner's Works, Vol. V, 197, 198.

¹⁴⁰Lect. v1, p. 150.

Father of Greek History” in the classic world, is said to have been cited by Ctesias only once in the first century; and in the second century by Aristotle alone; *and in the third century by no writer whatever; and in the fourth, by Chrus and by Cicero.* Thucydides (B. C. 470–403), the greatest Greek historian, is first quoted by Hermippus, about two centuries after the publication of his work. Tacitus, the greatest of Roman historians, who wrote about A. D. 110, is mentioned once by his personal friend Pliny the younger in a mere friendly and incidental way, but he is not quoted or referred to in any writings until the close of the second century, by Tertullian.

Professor John J. Given, of London, says:

“Every one acquainted with the matter will agree with us when we affirm that *there is ten times stronger and more satisfactory evidence for the genuineness and substantial integrity of the books of the Scriptures than for the History of Tacitus and Thucydides, of Livy and Xenophon, about which no scholar ever entertains a doubt.* If beginning with the present century we trace the writings of the New Testament, for example, backwards and upwards along the stream of time to the very source, we shall find them accredited by each foregoing generation and by men of each preceding century, till we reach the days of primitive Christianity itself, when we find them universally believed by early Christians to be the works of their eight reputed authors, and quoted as such by the earliest Christian writers and contemporaries and successors of the primitive penmen. Add to this the testimony of neutrals, apostates, heretics, foes as well as friends of Christianity. *What more conclusive proof of authorship can reasonable criticism demand, or the archives of human literature produce, than this combined and concurrent testimony of the genuineness of the Sacred Scriptures?*” ¹⁴¹

That we have not now any Greek copies of the New Testament of earlier date than 325 A. D. by no means necessitates the conclusion that none existed previously; for, as will be seen, these Scriptures were constantly §416. Citations by the Fathers. appealed to and cited by the Fathers of the Church. An incident gives point and illustration to this fact. In the course of conversation which occurred in London between Dr. Buchanan and Lord Hales, a curious but most interesting question was proposed: “If every copy of the New Testament

¹⁴¹ *Revelation, Inspiration, and Canon*, 210–212.

had been destroyed [under the Diocletian-Maximian persecution] at the end of the third century, could it be recovered from extracts made from it in the works of the Fathers of the second and third centuries?" After a short lapse of time these personages met again, when the subject was renewed by Lord Hales saying: "As I possess all the extant Fathers of the second and third century, I commenced the search; and *up to the present time, I have found the entire New Testament, all but eleven verses!*"¹⁴² How could the Fathers of the second and third centuries have made their numerous and copious citations from these Scriptures unless they were then and previously in existence?

In bringing to a close the argument for the antiquity, authenticity, and the historicity of the New Testament, it is proper to remark that the enemies of Christianity *affirm* the cardinal facts narrated in these books, naming nearly all of the authors, and refer to their *writings*, which they evidently had in their possession in the second and third century. The witness of friends *confirms* the testimony of the enemies, carrying upward the citations from the same and other books, naming the same writers, through the same centuries, to the very times of the apostles themselves. The *internal evidence* of the genuineness and historicity of the several books furnished by their ancient *titles* as well as the *signatures* of apostolic authority in all the Epistles; the lack of signatures to the historical books explained by Chrysostom as due to their personal deliverance directly to those to whom they were immediately addressed; with the added evidence of *nearly ten thousand references and citations from these Scriptures, made therefrom in less than two centuries after they were written and published,—constitute a combination of proofs which can not be adduced in favor of the authorship, antiquity, and historicity of any other book, or set of books, in the whole literary world.*

¹⁴² *New Companion of the Bible*, cited by Professor Given in his *Canon*, p. 361.

A further proof on this subject is needless. The inductions on the facts adduced are inevitable. According to *the Rule of Evidence*, cited from Greenleaf as the highest authority for the practice of the courts on all historical questions, the sacred books have always been in *the proper custody*, being in the possession of the Church. The contents of the earliest Greek manuscripts, and of the still earlier versions in other languages, attest the identity of the facts and doctrines with the Scriptures which we now possess. Their antiquity and historicity are therefore established. It only remains to present a *Tabulated Exhibit* of references to, and quotations from, *all the books of the New Testament*, made by two eminent Fathers in the Church, and by two of the greatest Apologists who defended the Christian faith and people before the Roman Government. These citations of Scripture were made at different dates, according to the time when the different writers wrote, the remotest being *within one hundred and eighty-five years after the publication of most of the books of the New Testament, and within about one hundred and fifty years of the time that the writings of John the apostle appeared, and were received by the Church.*

The words of Professor Given are here in place, respecting the antiquity and authenticity of these sacred writings as a whole:

“No one can pretend to gainsay the fact that they have been established on a hundred-fold more historical basis than of those literary productions of classical antiquity which nobody ever thinks of calling in question.”¹⁴³

The great *uncial* manuscripts of the New Testament date about from 325 down to the sixth century; but *Versions* and text can be traced back to the second century. There is no known manuscript of Herodotus or of Thucydides dating earlier than *the tenth*, or of Xenophon earlier than *the eleventh* to the *thirteenth* century. There is no reference in literature

¹⁴³ Professor Given on *N. T. Canon*, p. 212.

to Thucydides for *two centuries after his death*. *Nor can any Latin History bear the test which is applied to the books of the New Testament*. The first six books of Tacitus's *Annals* depend on *only one MS.*, dating not earlier than the ninth century. (See Watkin's *Bampton Lectures*, 1890, p. 138, note.)

The following exhibit is compiled from Keith's *Demonstration of the Truth of Christianity*, and Mair's *Christian Evidences*. The figures given are approximate, if not exact.

§ 417. The Citations Made Between 65-248 A. D.

	Irenæus.	Clement of Alex- andria.	Ter- tullian.	Origen.	Total	Grand Total.
Years after the Publica- tion of the New Testa- ment.	115	150	150	185		
Matthew	180	180	400	1352	2112	
Mark	15	20	80	185	300	
Luke	125	110	500	649	1384	
John	80	60	240	775	1155	
Acts	50	20	110	147	327	5278
Romans	60	110	160	731	1061	
1 Corinthians	70	150	350	620	1190	
2 Corinthians	17	30	120	238	405	
Galatians	22	14	67	150	253	
Ephesians	27	15	64	135	241	
Philippians	10	11	31	68	120	
Colossians	10	8	24	91	133	
1 Thessalonians	2	4	24	48	78	
2 Thessalonians	8	1	18	26	53	
1 Timothy	5	11	33	92	141	
2 Timothy	5	5	18	55	83	
Titus	2	2	5	18	27	
Philemon	0	0	0	3	3	3788
Hebrews	9	11	12	154	186	
James	3	0	2	20	25	
1 Peter	5	8	12	50	75	
2 Peter	0	0	0	5	5	
1 John	6	6	39	77	128	
2 John	3	0	0	0	3	
3 John	0	0	2	0	2	
Jude	0	0	0	6	6	
Revelation	33	2	80	60	175	605
	747	778	2391	5749	9671	9671

CHAPTER XX.

MANUSCRIPTS—VERSIONS—CANON.

I. GREEK MANUSCRIPTS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

1. The Codex Alexandrinus.
2. The Codex Vaticanus.
3. The Codex Sinaiticus.
4. The Codex Rossanensis.

II. VERSIONS FROM THE GREEK IN OTHER LANGUAGES.

1. The Old Latin Version :
 - a) The Vulgate of Jerome.
2. The Syriac Versions :
 - a) The Peshito Version.
 - β) The Cureton Version.
 - γ) The Harklein Version.
 - δ) A Syrian Gospel, 1895.
3. The Egyptian Versions :
 - a) The Memphitic Version.
 - β) The Thebaic Version.
 - γ) The Bushmuric Version.

III. CANON OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

1. The Councils and the Canon.
2. The Historical Canon.
 - a) Synod of Laodicea.
 - β) Catalogues of the New Testament.
 - γ) Council of Trent.
 - δ) How our Canon was Established.

THE CONCLUSION.

CHAPTER XX.

MANUSCRIPTS—VERSIONS—CANON.

§418. Manuscripts—Versions—Canon.

Ye should earnestly contend for the faith which was once delivered to the saints.—JUDE.

In regard to the great Book, I have only to say that it is the best gift which God has given to man.—ABRAHAM LINCOLN.

No book contains more truths, or is worthy of more confidence, than the Bible; for none brings more comfort to the sorrowing, more strength to the weak, or more stimulus to the nobly ambitious; none makes life sweeter, or death easier or less sad.—JUSTICE DAVID J. BREWER.

Every fair-minded, unbiased person who will carefully read the Bible, with the desire to master its contents, will find abundant evidence of its Divine origin, and that it was designed to teach our duty to God and our fellow-men.—CHIEF JUSTICE MAXWELL, NEB.

Hold fast the Bible as the sheet-anchor of your liberties; write its precepts upon your hearts, and practice them in your lives.—ULYSSES S. GRANT.

I have always had, and shall always have, a profound regard for Christianity.—HENRY CLAY.

I own that I never read the New Testament with attention.—DAVID HUME.

Your *Age of Reason* may prevail with some readers, [yet] you will not succeed as to change the general sentiments of mankind on the subject; and the consequence of printing your piece will be a great deal of odium drawn upon yourself; mischief to you, and no benefit to others. "He that spits against the wind, spits in his own face."—BENJAMIN FRANKLIN TO THOMAS PAINE.

My hatred and horror of infidelity are greater than ever. I know it to be the extreme of madness and misery, the utter degradation and ruin of a man's soul.—JOSEPH BARKER. (A converted skeptic.)

Bring with thee the books, especially the parchments.—PAUL.

Yes, I might almost say to the Lord,
Here is a copy of Thy Word,
Written out with much toil and pain:
Take it, O Lord, and let it be,
As something I have done for thee.—LONGFELLOW.

ARGUMENT.

To give completeness to the whole historical argument of this treatise, a brief account of the circumstances which gave origin to the books of the New Testament, and our warrant now for their credibility, is superadded. The modern foundation for Christian belief in these Sacred Books is threefold,—ancient Greek manuscripts, versions in other languages, and the history of the Sacred Canon. It is proposed to refute the unhistorical pretense which has gained some credence, that an early Ecclesiastical Council assumed the authority to determine, by a capricious majority, what books should be voted into the Canon, and what others of equal claims should be rejected. When and how these Scriptures received their canonicity, will appear in the discussion; but it was centuries before any Council was convened.

Three classes of literature arose in the middle of the second century, from which the writings of the New Testament are to be discriminated: (1) Those in which certain Scriptures had been corrupted and mutilated by the heretics so as to suit their preconceived notions of what they should teach: (2) Those which were mere romances, purporting to give the life of Jesus, containing shreds of history, but, on the whole, spurious as they were puerile; and (3) Others which were issued as apostolic writings, but were fraudulent in fact, and bore the forged names of the apostles to give them authority. The Church of Christ took public measures of a decided character to protect itself from these impostures.

THE MANUSCRIPTS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

THE New Testament was not originally written and published as one volume as we now have it, but was composed of no less than twenty-seven distinct writings. It was not all written by one man, but it is the product of eight writers, who wrote from different countries, at different dates within about thirty-five years. Each separate document, however, had its own distinctive occasion and purpose, its individual function and scope; so that, when they were brought into one, an extraordinary interrelation was discovered, in which the teachings of the documents were found to be supplemental to, and confirmatory of, each other, and the whole evidenced *a deep internal unity of design, bearing the characteristics of a progressive revelation from God.*

§419. The New
Testament
Many in One.

No book in all the history of literature has exerted so powerful an influence upon human conduct and individual character and life; none ever so endeared itself to the heart of all classes and conditions of mankind. To the teachings of this volume the foremost nations of the earth bow with reverent homage, and profess to be guided in a large measure by its principles and spirit. Those civilizations which are acknowledged to hold the most masterful place in the family of nations, to be most advanced in science and literature, in learning and culture, in commerce and influence,—the most powerful in war, the most prosperous in peace, and invincible before all enemies,—are the Christian nations called the Great Powers of the world, who attribute their pre-eminence to the accepted truth and principles taught in these Scriptures.

It may be worth while to remark the external circumstances in which the New Testament was originally written. The art of ancient book-making is in this matter something more than interesting. We have not in our possession those original manuscripts which are called the Autographic Documents of the Apostles, but we do have the early Greek copies, which date about A. D. 325. Why there are none known of earlier possession will be explained hereafter.

§420. The
Ancient
Book-making.

The materials upon which the ancients wrote in the time of the apostles were either papyrus or parchment. Papyrus was made of the inner cellular tissues of the papyrus plant, a reed which grows in abundance in the Delta district, in the valley of the Nile, in Egypt. Thin strips were laid together in layers, the one placed horizontally and another vertically, and made to hold by means of a glutinous substance under great pressure.¹ The product was naturally delicate and perishable. Accordingly, papyrus was early superseded by the use of animal skins carefully prepared for the manufacture of manuscript books. Parchment was, indeed, a beautiful product

¹Wilken Breslas, George Ebers, and Sir Mamede Thompson.

of both sheep and goat skins. As evidencing the use of parchment in the apostolic times, Paul wrote to Timothy to bring with him to Rome the cloak which he had left at Troas, "and the books, especially the parchments."² It was about the third century when the skins of calves and young antelopes were converted into *vellum*, which largely superseded the poorer and cheaper materials used previously; but by the ninth century the art of its manufacture had deteriorated to such an extent that it was replaced by a coarse and common paper made of cotton rags. This was again superseded by a fine quality of paper made of linen. It was of fine and elegant texture quite resembling the earlier vellum, whose use continued until the art of printing was invented in the middle of the sixteenth century. The evidential value of these facts consists in the index which they furnish for determining the date of any given manuscript.

The writers of the early Christian centuries were called scribes, whose industry was that of *copyists*, which was regarded as a worthy and dignified work. There were two classes of scribes: the one called *Tachygraphers*, meaning *swift-writers*, who wrote rapidly in shorthand what authors dictated; the other class called *Calligraphers*, or *Beautiful writers*, who copied the shorthand reports in a large and elegant form resembling our copperplate. Paul, who was by far the most extensive writer of the New Testament, employed amanuenses to do his writing. One Tertius, a Christian copyist, is especially mentioned as uniting with the apostle in Christian salutation to the Roman brethren: "I Tertius, who wrote this epistle, salute you in the Lord."³

It is related that Origen employed many transcribers, and his friend Alexander, Bishop of Jerusalem, founded one of the earliest libraries of ecclesiastical manuscripts at Cæsarea-on-the-Sea, to which Eusebius had free access in writing his historical works. It is stated that, upon the accession of Con-

² 2 Tim. iv, 13.

³ Rom. xvi, 22.

stantine to the throne of the empire at Constantinople, he issued an imperial edict to Eusebius to prepare fifty imperial copies of the New Testament entire, to be written by the very best copyists, on the finest vellum, in the form of rolls, subject to imperial examination. The work was accomplished in the library of Alexander, from the transcriptions of Origen. These volumes, when completed, were transported in two wagons of the government from Cæsarea to Constantinople, whereupon the emperor examined and distributed the manuscripts to be kept in the custody of the several Churches for future use and careful preservation. The great critics, Tregelles, and Bleek, and others, entertained the belief that these very books are now in possession of the Biblical scholars and in the libraries of Europe.⁴

The sacred manuscripts are of two general classes, belonging to two different periods, and are easily distinguished by their chirography. The older class of writings were designated *Uncials*,⁵ because written originally, as supposed, in letters about an inch in length.

§ 422. Two
Classes of
Manuscripts.

The text appears without a break in the lines, or space between words, or any mark of punctuation. Whenever occasion served, a word was divided at the end of a line, but without regard to the syllables. However, there were certain indications of paragraphs or divisions of the text. The four Gospels were marked by irregular sections, and in the later copies these are found also in Acts and the Epistles. Ammonius of Alexandria marked off certain parallel passages in the four Gospels in order to harmonize them; and after him, Eusebius modified these by making ten tables called "Canons." In manuscripts of the fifth century, certain *titles*⁶ were given sections as headings, designated by a given number. Matthew had sixty-eight titles, Mark had forty-eight, Luke eighty-three, and John eighteen. At a later period these marks are found also upon Acts and the Epistles.

⁴ Merrill's *Story of the Manuscripts*, p. 28.
Τίτλοι, titles, superscriptions.

⁵ From *Uncia*, an inch.

Another class of manuscripts far more numerous are called *Cursives* because written in a running hand, on parchment or vellum, and also on cotton and linen paper. The cursives are characterized by certain dots placed over the lines, by spaces between the words and sentences, and by an irregular system of punctuation, indicating an advance upon the older style of writing. This class began with the tenth century. Many of the cursive class are wrought with the greatest painstaking, and have the quality of elegance. The vellum used was often of very delicate finish, sometimes dyed with richest coloring, the text being written in bold and beautiful characters, in colored inks or in silver, and brilliantly illuminated by hand. When a manuscript has been once written and erased, and used again, it is called a *palimpsest*.⁷ The ink, having been made of vegetable substance, was easily obliterated; and a given vellum having been once written over, the writing was *rubbed off* to make place for a second and even a third text to be inscribed. By means of a chemical process discovered by Dr. Tischendorf, all the erased writings are recoverable and the desired text restored.

The *Uncial* manuscripts of the New Testament, according to Scrivener,⁸ number about ninety-seven; and of the *cursives*, about one thousand, nine hundred and ninety-seven. Occasionally, in order to obtain a complete copy of these Scriptures, a combination is made of the several parts or fragments, which are made to supplement each other; but the parts are of different chronology, and therefore of unequal antiquity and value for *critical* purposes. All the manuscripts of the New Testament now known are in the form of books, several volumes of which embrace these Scriptures. These manuscript-books are prepared in the form of a folio, a quarto, or a duodecimo. They are distributed, mostly in the libraries of European *countries*, as follows: Sweden has one copy; Ireland has three; Den-

§ 423. Distribu-
tion of
Manuscripts.

⁷ Ψῆν (ψάω), to rub away, and πάλιν, again

⁸ *Introd.* 3d ed. 1883.

mark, three; Holland, six; Scotland, seven; Switzerland, fourteen; Spain, nineteen; Russia, over seventy; Germany and Austria, ninety; England, two hundred and fifty; Italy, three hundred and twenty. So by *cities*: Pesth has two; Treves, two; Modena, six; Hamburg, six; Naples, nine; Cambridge, nineteen; Turin, twenty; Munich, twenty-seven; Vienna, twenty-eight; Venice, fifty; Florence, fifty; Oxford, one hundred and twenty-five; Rome, one hundred and twelve, of which more than a hundred are in the library of the Vatican; Paris has two hundred and twenty-eight, which are in the Imperial Library, besides ten placed elsewhere in France.

Only one uncial book contains the entire New Testament complete in itself, although thirty of all kinds have substantially all these sacred writings. The Gospels are more numerous than the Epistles. Of the sixty-three uncials of all kinds, fifty-seven are of the Gospels. Dr. Scrivener gives six hundred and twenty-three cursives of the Gospels, while Acts and the General Epistles have fourteen uncials and two hundred and thirty-two cursives. Paul's Epistles are written in fifteen uncials, and in two hundred and eighty-three cursives. The Book of Revelation is written in five uncials, and one hundred and five cursives. Many of these manuscript books are stained with age, the vellum being fragile and worm-eaten. The following codices are regarded as most valuable critically, namely:

1. THE ALEXANDRINE CODEX.

This codex was brought from Egypt in 1628 by Cyril Lucar, Patriarch of Constantinople, and presented in person to Charles I, and is now in possession of the British Museum. Dr. Scrivener assigns this interesting document to the beginning, but Dr. Davidson to the middle, of the fifth century. An autograph note from the patriarch named accompanied the codex, certifying that the Egyptian tradition refers the copying of the document to the

§ 424 .Supple-
mentary
Manuscripts.

§ 425. Its His-
tory and
Description.

martyred and sainted Thecla, about thirteen hundred years previously; and this corresponds with an Arabic note on the first page, attesting the same fact. This would place the date in the early part of the fourth century, and it is doubted on just grounds.

The Alexandrine Codex was the best known and most studied by the scholars of the past. It consists of four books, one of which contains the New Testament. At the beginning of the several books the first line is written in vermilion. The text is in uncial characters, marked with Ammonian sections, bearing "titles" as heads; but there are no spaces between words, no accents or breathing signs at the aspirates in this Greek. The paragraphs are made conspicuous with initial letters, and a new line marks the divisions. Each page has two columns; each column has fifty lines, with about twenty letters to the line. The manuscript evidences many erasures and abbreviations; and there are grave defects in the document. It begins with Matthew xxv, 6, and omits John vi, 50, to viii, 52; and 2 Cor. iv, 13, to xii, 6.

2. THE VATICAN CODEX.

This codex ranks at least among the best transcripts of the New Testament. It is supposed to be nearly two hundred years older than the Alexandrine. It was found § 426. Its History. by Pope Nicholas V, a great scholar in his age, in the year 1448. It was long kept concealed in the Vatican at Rome by the successive popes; and although it was twice captured by Napoleon I, and carried away to Paris, after his defeat at Waterloo in 1815, with other treasures, it was restored by the allied powers to Italy. When this occurred, Tregelles was but three years old, learning his vernacular in England, and Tischendorf was yet a child of two in his mother's arms at Legenfeld, in Germany.

In form it is in red morocco quarto, ten and a half inches in length, and ten inches broad, and about five inches thick. con-

taining seven hundred and fifty-nine thin leaves of vellum, of which one hundred and forty-six contain the New Testament. It is written in uncial character, § 427. Its Description. three columns to the page. There are no divisions except the spaces made by the omission of letters, as at the beginning of a new subject; and there are no punctuation marks. Dr. Tischendorf dated this document in the fourth century, and Dr. Tregelles assigned it to the end of the first quarter of that century.

3. THE SINAITIC CODEx.

This manuscript is one of the most ancient and valued of the whole collection. In the first instance, Dr. Tischendorf in the year 1844, discovered the document in § 428. Its History and Description. forty-four old, molded leaves which were brought to him for kindling his fire, at the convent of St. Catherine, at the foot of Mount Sinai. He presented these leaves as the Codex Frederica-Augusta, in honor of his patron, the Saxon king, to the library of the University in Leipzig. These leaves belonged to the Old Testament. In 1859, Tischendorf in the same place found the remainder of the document, which he presented to his Russian patron, Emperor Alexander II. In 1862 the government issued a magnificent *fac simile* of the manuscript in four folio volumes, as a memorial of the One Thousandth Anniversary of the Russian Empire. Copies were presented to the great institutions and libraries of the world. About a dozen copies were sent to the United States, and are found in our great libraries. In the consensus of Christendom, the Codex Vaticanus and the Codex Sinaiticus are held for all critical purposes as the most ancient and most valuable of all the codices of the New Testament.

The writing is in the uncial style, upon very fine thin vellum, in three hundred and forty-six and a half leaves, which are thirteen and a half inches in length by more than fourteen inches in breadth. The text of the New Testament is in four

columns of forty-eight lines each on a page, the whole number of pages being one-hundred and forty-seven and a half. It is without accents or aspirates, without spacing between words, or large initials to indicate the beginning of a paragraph. In connection with this manuscript was found the Epistle of Barnabas, and a part of the Shepherd of Hermas, and a large portion of the Old Testament.

4. THE CODEX OF ROSSANO.

This *Codex Rossanensis* is among the latest discoveries of manuscripts related to the New Testament. It takes its name from a village named Rossano, near which, on a hill, the document was found, in South Italy, about three miles from the sea. It does not rank as first class for the objects of critical investigation; but it is easily first in respect to its pictorial illustrations, being the oldest pictorial Gospel known. It is adorned with about forty miniatures in rich and vivid colors, on the margins and spaces. The subjects are prominent scenes of the Gospels,—the Parable of the Ten Virgins and the Bridegroom; the Triumphal Entry of Jesus into Jerusalem; Judas Restoring the Thirty Pieces of Silver, and in the background is depicted his body dangling from the bough of a tree; the Scene of the Lord's Agony in Gethsemane; and a representation of the four Evangelists, each bearing a book on his left arm, while the right hand is extended in the act of benediction. Professors Gebhardt and Harnack, who discovered this work, issued a descriptive volume of the manuscript, with *fac similes* and miniatures in outline and monochrome.

The document is a thick quarto, bound in strong black leather, containing the two Gospels of Matthew and Mark—a purple vellum of one hundred and eighty-eight pages, written in uncial letters, in double columns of silver text, twenty lines to the column, and from nine to twelve letters to the line. The first three lines of each Gospel are written with gold.

§ 429. Its History and Description.

The words are without spaces, without accents, without aspirates, with few erasures, and with only an occasional punctuation. It has the Ammonian sections and the Eusebian canons. From these internal evidences of its antiquity, it is assigned as having been written in the fifth, or at least the sixth, century.

These are the principal Greek manuscripts yet discovered of a high antiquity and superior authority. They furnish important advantages for the critical study of the New Testament. But some passages have been rendered doubtful by liberties taken with the text in transcribing these sacred books. The alteration of a single letter by mistake, or by the insertion of a word explanatory, written by the copyist or the reader on the margin of the document, became incorporated into the text by a subsequent transcriber, has the effect to put the true and original text in doubt. A careful and critical comparison and editing of the several texts collated, furnish the means of detecting and correcting any such error. Truly these instances of corrupting the text are in most unimportant passages, and in the vast majority of instances are a mere matter of spelling; but clearly where the sense is changed even in minor details, one prefers fact to fiction. The critical Michælis classed these divers readings, attributing them to one of the following causes or occasions, viz.:

“1. The omission, addition, or exchange of letters, syllables, or words, from the mere carelessness of the transcribers.

“2. Mistakes of the transcribers in regard to the true text of the original.

“3. Errors or imperfections in the ancient manuscripts from which the transcriber copied.

“4. Critical conjecture, or intended improvements of the original text.

“5. Willful corruptions [made in some copies] to serve the purpose of a party, whether orthodox or heterodox.”

A very natural question arises whether scholars may not be exposed to the imposition of spurious documents by experts

§430. Occasion
of
Errors.

in old Scriptology? Frauds have been attempted again and again. It was the opinion of Dr. Scrivener that §431. Detection of Impostures. in England alone there were at least fifty different persons who could detect the most skillfully-executed fraud of this character that the world could produce, on the mere internal evidence of the case. Some remarkable instances are cited. In 1856, one Constantine Simonides, a most accomplished impostor, tried to sell, along with certain genuine manuscripts, a document purporting to be a classical history of an Egyptian. Dr. Tischendorf detected the fraud and telegraphed to Berlin to beware of the spurious document. Upon arriving, Simonides offered his manuscript for sale, when it was tested microscopically and also chemically, with the result that he was instantly arrested for attempted imposture. The same man, in the same way, offered for sale in the Bodleian Library, at Oxford, England, some genuine manuscripts and some fragments produced skillfully in the uncial text, the vellum being stained with age and bearing all the marks characteristic of a very early antiquity. The librarian merely smelled the leaves, and returning the fragments said that they dated in the middle of the nineteenth century!

THE VERSIONS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

The early translations were made from the Greek manuscripts into the vernacular speech of the various nations, and §432. The Uses of the Versions. circulated widely. These constitute another and more ancient source for determining the genuineness and authenticity of the sacred books. Being written in different languages and dialects, this fact in itself erects impassable barriers against success in any attempted corruptions of the sacred text. Versions, therefore, constitute an independent and invaluable line of Christian evidence, some of them antedating, and others paralleling, the proofs furnished by the Greek manuscripts already cited. Only the most important versions are here mentioned.

1. *The Old Latin Version.* This is claimed as first in value and in time, dating about the middle of the second century. Tertullian of Carthage, Cyprian of Alexandria, and Augustine of Africa, were familiar with this translation. It was used in the fourth century in Piedmont and Lombardy, in Northern Italy. The version originated in Africa about A. D. 150. Christianity spread rapidly then, and the Old Latin version went with Christianity. It contains the Canon of the New Testament.

Out of this Old Latin version came *the Vulgate*, which is held in such high honor, a revision made by the scholarly Jerome. He began his work at Rome in A. D. 383, and concluded it in his monastic cell, in the Church of the Nativity, at Bethlehem of Judæa, in 385. The revision was urged upon Jerome by the Roman Bishop Damasus, and was intended for the common people speaking the Latin language, as its name imports. Dr. Scrivener remarks of the revision:

“As an interpretation, the Vulgate far surpasses its prototype; as an instrument of criticism, it is decidedly superior, where the evidence of the Old Latin may be had, bringing before us the testimony, good and bad, of documents of the second century; but only that of the manuscripts which Jerome deemed correct and ancient at the end of the fourth [century].”

2. *The Syriac Versions.* These constitute a second class of the first importance. The *Aramaean* branch of the Semitic family of languages was used in Northern Syria. These Versions are among the most ancient and most valued of the New Testament. These are:

a) *The Peshito*; that is, “simple, literal, faithful.” It is written in Old Syriac, and is dated by most scholars near the middle of the last half of the second century; but Michælis places it in the first century. Eusebius says of Hegesippus, the first Christian historian after the Evangelists, that “he also states some particulars [citations] from the Gospel of the Hebrews, and from the Syriac.” The *Peshito* is wanting in the

Second and Third Epistles of John, Second Epistle of Peter, that of Jude, and also Revelation. It contains all the rest of our Canon. The version is remarkable for its purity and exactness of translation. The Syrian Christians hold that their version is the original New Testament, which claim, however, is hardly valid. Nevertheless the Churches in Syria have certainly had in unbroken use these Scriptures from an early antiquity until now.

β) *The Cureton Version.* This is so named in respect to Dr. Cureton, who discovered and first published it. It is a fragment of eighty-two and a half leaves, but is one of the earliest of the Syriac versions. It was discovered in 1842 in a convent of the desert, about seventy miles northwest from the city of Cairo, in Egypt. Scrivener seems to place the date in the fifth century, and says that it is "inferior in every respect to the primitive version, which is still read throughout the Churches of the East." But other critics, such as Cureton, Tregelles, Alford, Ewald, Bleek, and others also, believe that this text dates earlier than the Peshito.

γ) *The Harklean Syriac Version* belongs to the fifth century, and was written by the heretical Bishop Xenias, of Eastern Syria. It is in the Protestant College at Beirut.

δ) *A Syrian Gospel*, discovered in 1895 at St. Catherine convent, Mount Sinai, has attracted considerable attention recently. A photograph of this, with several other documents in Syriac, Greek, and Arabic, was taken by Mrs. Lewis and her twin sister, Mrs. Gibson, from Cambridge, England. The Syriac Codex consisted of one hundred and ten pages. Its peculiarity is in differing from all the Gospels of the Canon in representing the opposite of the doctrine of the Incarnation. It reads: "Joseph, to whom was betrothed the Virgin Mary, begat Jesus, who was called Christ." This circumstance, indicating a departure from all the Greek manuscripts which were original, would suggest that its origin was due to a heretic of the middle of the second century, which is the

date claimed for this document. If so, it is the recovery of one of those corrupted and mutilated Gospels issued by the Gnostics or Ebionites of that period, when they chose to alter the text to conform to their own peculiar preconceived views of what *the Gospel ought to teach*.

3. *The Egyptian Versions* are otherwise known as *the Coptic Versions*. They are written in three dialects, namely:

α) *The Memphitic (JBahiric) dialect*, which was spoken in Lower Egypt, of which there are extant twenty-eight manuscripts of the Gospels, seventeen of Acts, the Pauline, and the General Epistles, and ten of the Book of Revelation. This version is held to be the purest and freest from corruptions of all those of the second century.

β) *The Thebaic (Sahidic) Version*, which belonged to Upper Egypt, is a mere fragment.

γ) *The Bashmuric (Elearchian) Version* was made in the third century. It consists of fragments of John's Gospel and of the Pauline Epistles.

These several versions go quite far in filling up the gap between the writing of the Gospels in A. D. 55–65 and the first *Greek* manuscripts dating 325 A. D.

THE CANON OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

The term *Canon*⁹ originally meant a measuring rule in mechanics. It thence easily acquired the figurative sense of a rule of life. In its application to religion, it imports the rule which tests our faith and practice. When applied to the Scriptures, it is called *the Sacred Canon*, meaning that rule by which the several books which constitute the Bible were originally placed in authority in the Church as containing the Word of God. The term *Canon* is here employed with special reference to the respective books of the New Testament, whether viewed as individual writings, or collectively as a body of Scrip-

§ 433. Meaning
of the
Canon.

⁹ Κανών, *Canon*.

tures, and the manner in which they came to be regarded as the authoritative source and standard of Christian belief.

A false notion has gained considerable publicity and credence respecting the method by which these books had as-

§ 434. The
Canon and
the Councils.

signed to them a canonical character. It is supposed by some that the claim of these writings to this high authority originated in and is due to the decision of a Churchly Council; that the several documents constituting our New Testament were subjected to a selection of this literature to the exclusion of other literature of equal claim, by a class of incapable men at the Council of Nicæa in A. D. 325, who arbitrarily voted these books into the Canon, and as arbitrarily rejected the others, in accordance with their own peculiar ignorance, caprice, and power as a majority! The hypothesis is a fiction, and is utterly destitute of historical truth. The sacred Canon did not originate in that way; and *the Council of Nicæa did not touch the subject*. Neither at Jerusalem where Christianity was cradled, nor at Rome where it centralized, nor at Antioch where the disciples were first called Christians, nor yet at Nicæa where the first Ecclesiastical Council met in the presence of Constantine the first Christian emperor, was any such movement known or contemplated. We do not find in history that the apostles of Jesus in their collective capacity, or their pupils the Apostolic Fathers, or any of their successors, adopted a procedure so absolutely unsafe and absurd. Nor could such a course have won the confidence, much less have commanded the faith of the myriads of intelligent people who hastened to embrace the Christian religion at the peril of their lives, in the first epochs of Christianity. Now, no man is willing to die for a lie, he knowing it to be such; but multitudes of men, women, and even children, who were in a position to know whereof they affirmed, surrendered life itself under the cruelest conditions that could be imposed, rather than yield their confidence in the Christ of these Scriptures. If such procedure

had been historical, the New Testament were a worthless class of documents.

It is always difficult to trace mere myths to their origin. But something more than a half-century ago, William Hone, of Great Britain, issued two editions of a work which first appeared with this truthful title, *The Apocryphal New Testament*, but with the purpose of disparaging our authentic and Canonical Scriptures. Subsequently he issued a new edition with the title-page reading: “*The Suppressed Gospels and Epistles of the Original New Testament of Jesus Christ, venerated by the Primitive Christian Churches during the first four centuries, but since, after violent disputations, forbidden by the Bishops of Nicene Council, in the reign of the Emperor Constantine.*” It would seem a sufficient refutation of the pretense, that these two title-pages be held up in open contradiction of each other. The first title affirms that the writings were *spurious*; the second denies the admission, insisting that they are *historical*! The claim that any “violent disputation” whatever occurred respecting receiving any books into the Sacred Canon, in the Council of Nicæa, is altogether fabulous. Mr. Hone was at that time an ardent adversary of Christianity; but he is said to have since regretted the publication of his book in the form given, and with the object of its issue. He represented that our Scriptures of the New Testament were selected out of a large number of other works on the same subject, of equal worth and acceptability; and that the selection was made arbitrarily by ignorant and incompetent persons, who were unworthy of our confidence. His work was offered as an answer to his own question: “After the writings contained in the New Testament were selected from the numerous Gospels and Epistles, what became of the books that were rejected by the compilers?” Mr. Hone also cites an old fable of the Dark Ages, “a mediæval story,”* which originated centuries after the Nicene Council, to the effect that the selection of our Canonical New Testament was “made

* Indorsed by Häckel, in *Riddle of the Universe*, p. 327.

§ 435. Fiction
for
History.

by a miracle; that a number of books were placed upon and under a given table; that the party in charge then prayed over the matter and retired for the night; that in the morning it was found that the right books had of themselves jumped upon the table, and the wrong books had gone under the table; and that the Sacred Canon of the New Testament was thus settled! Now, surprising to say, this credulous and superstitious Mr. Hone found readers just as gullible as himself, who believed that this fable was a fact! This man, however, grows suspicious that his position is untenable, and shifts his ground. After citing Jortin's opinion on the supposed violence of that Council, he intimates that *if the selection of our Canon did not actually occur as described, it was made by the people no more entitled to respect than were the members of that Council!* In this, Mr. Hone yields his former claim as entirely fictitious, and makes another affirmation equally groundless. He then furnishes his own preferred *apocryphal* Gospels, Acts, and Epistles, having shaped the documents conformably in chapters and verses with the Canonical Books; and in this particular attempts to do what he charges upon the Council as having done—attempts to perpetrate a fraud upon the world!

It is in place now to consider the proofs that the Nicene Council entertained no proposition whatever respecting the Canon of the New Testament. The first authority to be cited is that of Professor George Salmon, D. D., F. R. S., late of the University of Berlin, now Provost of Trinity College, Dublin, in his *Historical Introduction to the Books of the New Testament*. Referring to this apocryphal account of the origin of our Canon, he remarks:

§ 436. The
Historical
Canon.

“I need not tell you that *the Council of Nicæa did not meddle [at all] with the subject of the Canon, and we need not trouble ourselves in discussing the proofs.* . . . The fact is, that, as I have told you, *authority did not meddle with the question,* . . . and instead of this abstentation weakening the authority of our sacred books, the result has been that the great majority have higher authority than if their claim rested on

the decision of any Council, however venerable. *They rest on the spontaneous consent of the whole Christian world, the Churches the most remote agreeing independently to do honor to the same books.* Some of the books which Mr. Hone printed as left out 'by the compilers of our Canon,' were not in existence when the Canon was established; and the best of the others is separated in the judgment of any sober man, by a wide interval from those which we account Canonical."¹⁰

Bishop B. F. Westcott, than whom there is no higher critical authority of the past century on the subject of *The Canon of the New Testament*, says:

"The first Synod at which the books of the Bible were made the subject of a special ordinance, was that of Laodicea [about A. D. 365], in Phrygia Pacatiana. . . . Neither in this [Nicene Council], nor in the following Councils, were the Scriptures themselves ever *the subject of discussion.* They underlie all controversy as a sure foundation, known and immovable." "*Scripture was the source from which the champions and assailants of the orthodox faith derived their premises.*"¹¹

Since the Scriptures were the basis of discussion, and not the subject discussed, it is obvious that, at some earlier time and by some other mode, our Canon was established as the basis. The sanction as well as the sanctity of these sacred books must be discovered in the immediate relations existing between the apostolic writers and those persons and Churches to whom the writings, in the first instance, were handed or sent by the respective authors. How could it be otherwise? The conditions for securing acceptance were ample to satisfy the most critical; but they were at the farthest remove from a Churchly Council.

Bishop Westcott again remarks:

"That a book should be 'acknowledged' as Canonical, it was requisite that its *authenticity* should be undisputed [universally], and that its author should have been possessed of *apostolic power*; if it were supposed to fail in satisfying either of these conditions, then it was 'disputed,' however well it satisfied the other [condition]."¹²

The first public cognizance given the Canon was that of the small *Synod* of Laodicea, "a gathering of the clergy from

¹⁰ *Introd.* pp. 175, 176.

¹¹ *The Canon of the New Testament*, 429, 430, 431.

¹² *Ib.* 421.

parts of Lydia and Phrygia," composed of thirty-two members.

§ 437. Synod
of
Laodicea.

They did not attempt to *determine* what books were to be held as Canonical, but they took action *formally to define, in a public manner,* those books which historically had been accepted and recognized as Canonical from the time that they were first published. That is, the Synod *did not make any selection of the sacred books at all, but for certain reasons catalogued the books as having been Canonical from the beginning. The effect of this action was to give publicity, emphasis, and confirmation to the Canon as originally established by the apostles, which until then had never had the formality of a public declaration by the Church.* Now, evidently, to *ratify* a given matter, is not to *originate it*; and merely to *give it public utterance* is not to *make a public selection of literature.* The Synod of Laodicea did not create the sacred Canon. It *reaffirmed the universal consensus of the Church from the time of the apostles for three centuries.* There its function ceased.

The immediate occasion for cataloguing the sacred books and giving public announcement of the Canon, as was done at

§ 438. The Oc-
casion for
Such Action.

Laodicea, was the character of the literature which had appeared and claimed a rivalship in some sense. Works of fiction purporting to give the life of Christ; spurious Epistles bearing the forged names of the apostles, as well as the corrupted and mutilated Scriptures which the heretics had produced, necessitated such a movement. Otherwise it was in the power of any impostor to circulate and palm off these apocryphal and fictitious writings upon the unwary as being apostolical and Canonical. To protect the Church of Christians, especially the converts and those wishing to become such, and all Christian communities, against fraud in all matters involving the sacred faith in Christ, it was indispensable that the distinction should be made known and be preserved inviolate between this sacred and secular literature. In consequence, it is said that no apoc-

ryphal writing ever found place on the catalogue of Canonical Books, or was ever referred to or quoted as being authoritative by either friends or foes of Christianity for many centuries. The apocryphal Scriptures were not in existence until from the middle of the second century and down to the fifth. So the Canonical Scriptures were long before recognized by the universal Church, and their character and authority thoroughly established before the spurious literature appeared. The Apostolic Fathers, named Clement, Barnabas, Hermas, Ignatius, and Polycarp, were the first writers after the apostles; and they constantly allude to these Canonical writings, and to no others, as authoritative in all matters pertaining to the Church and the Christian religion. *No apocryphal document ever found place in the sacred Canon.*

That the Christian communities had steadfastly made this discrimination between the sacred and the secular literature is evident from facts occurring during the terrible persecution in the joint reign of Diocletian and Maximian in 303. The government proposed the extermination of Christianity, and, *for the first time in history, required that the Christians should bring forward and publicly burn their sacred books*, under penalty of themselves being burned. The persecution derived its chief inspiration and force from Hierocles, proconsul of Bithynia at that date, and afterwards at Alexandria (306), a man who was well acquainted with the Canonical literature. Some Christians brought forward spurious books and burned them, which was satisfactory to the inquisitorial magistrates; but their Christian brethren viewed the procedure as highly wrong and deceptive, merely to avoid persecution, and did not hesitate to call them "*traitors.*"¹³ A schism followed and a controversy which lasted for three hundred years. Dr. Schaff observes:

§ 439. This Distinction Illustrated.

"In 303 Diocletian issued in rapid succession three edicts, each more severe than its predecessor. Maximian issued the fourth, the worst of

¹³ *Traditores.*

all, on April 30, 304. Christian churches were to be destroyed; all copies of the Bible were to be burned; all Christians were to be deprived of public office and civil rights; and last of all, all without exception were to sacrifice to the gods upon the pain of death. Pretext for this severity was afforded by the occurrence of fire twice in the palace of Nicomædia, where Diocletian resided."¹⁴

This wide destruction of the Christian Scriptures accounts for the fact that we have at present no earlier Greek manuscripts transmitted to us of the New Testament than those dating 325 A. D.; namely, the Codex Vaticanus and the Codex Sinaiticus. In reference to this persecution Bishop Westcott again remarks:

"The books of the New Testament were formed into distinct collections—'a quaternion of Gospels;' 'fourteen Epistles of St. Paul;' 'seven Catholic Epistles.' Both in the West and in the East the persecutor had done his work, and a New Testament rose complete from the fires which were kindled to consume it. That it rested on no authoritative decision [of a Council] is simply a proof that none was needed; and in the next chapter it will be seen that Conciliar Canons introduced no innovations, but *merely proposed to preserve the tradition which had been handed down.*" "But . . . the ordeal of persecution left the African Churches in possession of a perfect New Testament."¹⁵

Very many catalogues of these Scriptures have come down to us; some incomplete, others almost perfect, and all made at different dates, by different persons, Churches, or Councils. Those which agree exactly with our Canon now, *are eleven in number.* They are here presented in their chronological order, as follows:

§ 440. Catalogues of the New Testament.

1. That of *Augustine* (A. D. 355), a man of powerful influence and great activity in the establishment of the *collective Canon* in the Western Church.

2. That of *Athanasius the Great* (d. 373), "the Father of Orthodoxy," in a Festal Epistle, gives our Canonical Books.

3. That of *Philastrius* (387), Bishop of Brescia, Italy, is also identical.

4. That of *Jerome* (390), a man of rarest talents and scholarly attainments; a remarkable Biblicist, possessing extraordinary influence in the Western Church.

¹⁴ *Hist. Christ. Church*, II, 66.

¹⁵ *Canon of N. T.*, pp. 425, 414.

5. That of the *Third Council of Carthage* (397) at Hyppo, a ratification.

6. That of *Epiphanius* (403), the Patriarch of Orthodoxy, Bishop of Constantiathe, capital of Cyprus, in his larger work against Heresies.

7. That of *Gelasius* (405), which declares our Canonical Books.

8. That of *Rufinus* (d. 410), of Aquileia, Italy, whose list is identical with ours.

9. That of *Innocens I* (d. 417), a Roman bishop, attests our Canon.

10. That of *Leontius* (590), a Byzantine by birth, and Bishop of Cyprus.

11. That of *Isidore* (d. 636), of Seville, leader in the Spanish Church, and president of two Councils, contains the same.

The Council of Trent (A. D. 1546)* was distinctively a Roman Catholic affair. It was the only Council that undertook to construct a Canon for themselves, and this related exclusively to *the Old Testament*.

§ 441. The
Council
of Trent.

The object of having the Council was to condemn the Protestant principles and doctrines. For the first time in the history of the Church, the books of the Bible were made an article of faith. While this Council did not touch the Canon of the New Testament, it did add the several *Apocryphal Books* of the Old Testament, and put them upon the same plane with the Scriptures—books which had never claimed to be sacred or Canonical. This was a matter of deep offense and stern indignation on the part of Protestantism, which rejected the decree outright. On February 15, 1546, the Council of Trent passed the decree, and published it on the 8th of April following, reading thus:

“The Holy and Œcumenical Council of Trent, . . . following the example of the orthodox Fathers, receives and venerates all the

* May 1, 1564, was the date assigned the decrees were made binding. (*Encycl. Britt.* Vol. XXIII, 585, Phil'a edition. Westcott assigns the decree to April 8, 1546, when the decree was finally adopted. (*Canon of N. T.*, p. 476.)

books of the Old and New Testaments . . . and also traditions pertaining to faith and conduct, . . . and with equal feeling of devotion and reverence." (Here is given a catalogue of the books of the Old and New Testaments; and the Apocryphal books named Tobit, Judith, Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, and First and Second Maccabees are added as sacred). "If, however, any one does not receive the entire books with all their parts as they are accustomed to be read in the Catholic Church, and in the Old Latin Vulgate edition [Jerome's with additions] as sacred and Canonical, and knowingly and wittingly despises the aforesaid traditions, *let him be Anathema.*"

Martin Luther condemned this action of the Council of Trent unqualifiedly; he said "A Council can not make that to be Scripture which is not Scripture by nature." John Calvin denounced the decree as "a most pernicious error, [viz.] that the Scriptures have only so much right as is conceded to them by the suffrages of the Church; as though the eternal and inviolable truth of God depends on the arbitrary will of men!" Bishop Westcott remarks:

"This fatal decree . . . was ratified by fifty-three prelates, among whom there was not one German, not one scholar distinguished for historical learning, not one who was fitted by special study for the examination of the subject, in which the truth could only be determined by the voice of antiquity. How completely the decision was opposed to the spirit and letter of the original judgments of the Greek and Latin Churches, how far in the doctrinal equalization of the disputed and acknowledged books of the Old Testament it was at variance with the traditional opinion of the West, how absolutely unprecedented was the conversion of an ecclesiastical usage into an article of belief, will be seen from the evidence which has already been adduced."¹⁶

So far respecting Councils and the settlement of the Sacred Canon.

If the Sacred Canon did not originate in the authority of any Council, it must have had its origin directly between the writer and the parties addressed. The Evangelists handed the Gospels in person to those who had requested them to be apostolically and authoritatively written. The Epistles, going out to distant countries, addressed to Churches, required to be carefully and

§ 442. How
Books Became
Canonical.

¹⁶ Westcott's *Canon of the N. T.*, 477, 478.

satisfactorily authenticated to find acceptance. They must come properly authenticated as apostolical, or the writing was held in "dispute;" not condemned absolutely, but held in suspense until the evidence satisfactory was furnished. Only persons of eminence in the Church were intrusted with bearing to the Churches an apostolical writing. The means and methods of travel for the conveying and circulating of sacred books were extremely slow. If a given document was returned for inspection and for the proper guarantees, much time was sometimes consumed before the document reached its ultimate destination and was universally accepted. Individuals could not traverse alone mountains and seas; they must delay for caravans and company. They must pass from one nation to another speaking a different language. Like the apostles in their missionary journeys, they were exposed in city and country to dangers, on mountain and on sea to disease and robbers, and everywhere were "in deaths oft." It is therefore easy to understand why a few of the smaller Epistles and the Apocalypse were slow in coming to hand and receiving acknowledgment, especially in case they were wanting in any of the indispensable requisites for their verification; *for no book was considered entitled to a place in the Sacred Canon until all the Churches of Christendom had independently, and upon proper guarantees, become entirely satisfied to give it recognition.* Thus the *Collective Canon was organized.* It sometimes occurred that a book, having justified its claim with some Churches, was "disputed" in other Churches where the claim had not yet been properly safeguarded. But it was not held to be Canonical without *universal* consent. Hence the occasion for long delays in the acknowledgment of its apostolicity. Paul was extremely careful in that his name appeared in the text at the beginning of every Epistle, and often at the end in connection with salutations, together with his personal and private "token in every Epistle." All this delay over a "disputed" writing, so far from creating suspicion respecting its claim, is a commendation

of the critical care which finally, on sufficient warrant of evidence, assigned it a place in the Sacred Canon by the universal consensus of the Churches.

In the first instance, all Christendom placed its ancient seal upon each individual book, and again upon the whole collectively, before these documents received sacred § 443. The Conclusion. canonicity. Moreover, it is a grateful circumstance to us that these writings have been transmitted to our hands with evidence so multiform and conclusive of their claim to authenticity and apostolicity. After all the early attempts to corrupt, and mutilate or absolutely destroy these Scriptures by burning, it is a matter of deep satisfaction to know that, kept in the custody of the Church with such jealous care, they have come down to us with marks of their imperishable purity and truth. Written originally in Greek, those ancient manuscripts which we now have in our possession attest the identity of their contents with our own sacred books. Translated into other languages and dialects, the ancient versions tell the story of preservation from corruption and destruction. Persons of eminence, having these documents in their possession for daily use in study, made constant and copious reference and citations in their own writings. The adversaries of Christianity in their active assaults upon the system, holding in their hands these Canonical Books, defiantly charged the authorship of the writings upon the apostles, giving each his proper name. Eleven Catalogues extending along the centuries, with a view to mark and preserve the discrimination between the sacred and the spurious, between the apostolic and the apocryphal, ratify completely our own Canon. The action of the early Councils to make public the same distinction, also confirmed and announced what had always been the consensus of the Church respecting the apostolical authenticity of its Scriptures—all attesting singly and unitedly the just claims of these writings to sacred canonicity.

Then, most of all, there has existed an institution with a

history of unbroken continuity, possessing an indestructible character and power in the world, which has been the watchful custodian of these Scriptures from the first. Its witness is invincible. That institution is the great Christian Church. From the founding of Christianity, whatever of character for power and glory it has possessed before mankind, it has professedly derived from its Founder, whose personality and life are the subject of the contents of these Scriptures. No other works of like antiquity have come down to us so completely inwrought and overwrought with the very seals and stamp of truth and apostolicity in the recognition of the wisest and most critical men. But the complete and final test of the Divine origin of these writings is, that it brings to our spiritual nature supreme satisfactions just where all else fails—that which rules us by a Divine right. It offers a gracious challenge to every man's consciousness to which it appeals. "If any man wills to do His will, he shall know of the doctrines whether they are of God."

A P P E N D I X .

- I. EXCURSUS A. JOSEPHUS'S TESTIMONY RESPECTING JESUS CHRIST.
- II. EXCURSUS B. PLINY'S STATE PAPER TO THE EMPEROR TRAJAN.
- III. EXCURSUS C. LOGIA OF THE LORD, OR THE "SAYINGS OF JESUS."
- IV. EXCURSUS D. THE DIDACHÉ, OR THE "TEACHING OF THE TWELVE APOSTLES."
- V. EXCURSUS E. THE MURATORIAN CANON; DESCRIPTION AND CONTENT.
- VI. EXCURSUS F. THE JEWISH TALMUD: EXPURGATED EDITIONS RESPECTING CHRIST.
- VII. EXCURSUS G. THE TOLEDOTH JESHU, OR "GOSPEL ACCORDING TO THE JEWS."
 - a) *Exhibit A. On the Chronology of the New Testament.*
 - β) *Exhibit B. On the High Priests and the Procurators of Palestine.*
 - γ) *Exhibit C. On Critical Opinions respecting Chronology of the Testimonies.*
 - δ) *Exhibit D. Table of Comparative Contemporaries of the Several Witnesses.*
 - e) *Exhibit E. Chronological Table of the Content of the Entire Work.*

EXCURSUS A.

TESTIMONY OF JOSEPHUS CONCERNING JESUS.

Γίνεται δὲ κατὰ τοῦτον τὸν χρόνον Ἰησοῦς, σοφὸς ἀνὴρ, εἶγε ἄνδρα αὐτὸν λέγειν χρῆ. Ἦν γὰρ παραδόξων ἔργων ποιητής, διδάσκαλος ἀνθρώπων τῶν ἡδονῇ τάληθῆ δεξομένων. Καὶ πολλοὺς μὲν Ἰουδαίους, πολλοὺς, δὲ καὶ τοῦ Ἑλληνικοῦ ἐπηγάγετο. Ὁ χριστὸς οὗτος ἦν. Καὶ αὐτὸν ἐνδείξει τῶν πρώτων ἀνδρῶν παρ' ἡμῶν σταυρῶ ἐπιτετιμηκότος Πιλάτου, οὐκ ἐπαύσαντο οἱ γὰρ πρώτον αὐτὸν ἀγαπήσαντες, ἐφάνη γὰρ αὐτοῖς τρίτην ἔχων ἡμέραν πάλιν ζῶν, των θείων προφητῶν ταυτὰ τε καὶ ἄλλα μυρία θαυμάσια περὶ αὐτοῦ εἰρηκότων. Εἰς ἔτι νῦν τῶν χριστιανῶν ἀπὸ τεῦδε ὀνομασμένων οὐκ ἐπέλιπε τὸ φύλον.

[TRANSLATION.]

“About this time arises Jesus, a wise man, if indeed it be right to call him a man; for he was a doer of wonderful works, a Teacher of men accepting the truth with pleasure. There followed him many of the Jews as well as also many of the Greeks. He was the Christ. And at the instigation of the chief men among us, Pilate had condemned him to the cross; those having loved him at the first did not cease. For he appeared to them alive again on the third day, the divine prophet having proclaimed both these things, and also ten thousand other wonderful things concerning him. And that class of those called Christians after him are not extinct unto this present time.” (*Jewish Antiquities*, Bk. xviii, c. 3, § 3.)

DISCUSSION.

Respecting the authenticity and integrity of this celebrated paragraph in the writings of Josephus, there has been considerable controversy among modern critics. Opinions have divided into three classes:

- 1) Those holding that the entire passage is an unqualified interpolation.
- 2) Those contending that it is authentic in part, but certain parts interpolated.
- 3) Those who maintain that the paragraph in its entirety is absolutely authentic.

It is an historical question, and must be treated as such upon the evidence of the case, without preconceived conclusions. After traversing the grounds *pro* and *con*, the reader will determine for himself the evidential value of each claim cited.

1. THE PASSAGE IS AN INTERPOLATION.

1. *It interrupts the general narrative.* This is a question of fact, and must be settled by a reference to the paragraph in its connection as it

stands. The author is tracing the several procedures of Pilate in the two preceding sections, which naturally suggest and lead up to the crucifixion of Jesus as his most iniquitous act. With much more propriety might the section which follows this be regarded as a digression; nevertheless, it has never yet been so claimed. Luke's reference to Herodias (Gospel, iii, 19, 20) is certainly very much more of a digression from the direct line of discourse than is this passage now in question; yet no one on that account has even suspected the digression in Luke of being an interpolation. Obviously the fact does not justify the inference.

2. *It is incompatible with the views of a Jew thus to refer to Jesus.* That is to say, "If it be right to call him a man, . . . a doer of many wonderful works," but especially to say that "*He is the Christ,*" would, by necessary implication, make Josephus, a stanch Jew, a Christian. Upon the contrary, it is maintained that such a conclusion is by no means necessitated. Josephus was an historian of liberal mind and characteristics towards others, always treating opposing views with due consideration and courtesy. There were other stanch Jews of that period who went quite as far as Josephus in their references to Christ and his apostles, but were never cognized as having become Christians on that account. For instance, Nicodemus, who is said to have been the third officer of the Jewish Sanhedrin, in an interview with Jesus by night said: "Rabbi, we know that thou art a Teacher sent from God, for no man can do these miracles which thou doest, except God be with him." (John iii, 2.) Nicodemus also defended Christ in the Sanhedrin, and seems to have silenced His enemies. (John vii, 45-53.) But there is no evidence that Nicodemus became a Christian. So also Gamaliel, "a Pharisee, a doctor of the law, had in honor of all people," stood for the defense of the apostles in the presence of the Sanhedrin, opposing all violent measures being decreed against them (Acts v, 34-40); but it was never claimed that he professed Christianity.

The strongest expression made by Josephus favoring Jesus was that "*He was the Christ.*" This may seem to convey more than was really meant. In another place this writer alludes to Jesus when mentioning that Ananus brought "James" before the Sanhedrin, "the brother of Jesus *who was called the Christ*" τὸν ἀδελφὸν Ἰησοῦ τοῦ λεγομένου χριστοῦ Ἰάκωβον ὄνομα αὐτῷ). So Renan claims: "Instead of *χριστὸς οὗτος ἦν* ["He was Christ"], it was certainly *χριστὸς οὗτος ἐλεγέτο he was called Christ.*" (*Life of Jesus*, Introd. p. 14, note.) The obvious sense, then, would be that among the many who rose among the Jews claiming to be the Christ, as Jesus had predicted, this one was pre-eminently called the Christ by the people. So Pilate placed the superscription upon the cross: "This is Jesus the King of the Jews" (Matt. xxvii, 37), not meaning literally that he was a monarch, but that he was called a King. (Compare John xviii, 37; xix, 14, 15; Luke xix, 38, etc.) Pilate, being himself the Roman procurator ruling the Jews, knew perfectly well that Jesus was not an earthly king, and did not claim earthly royalty.

3. *The passage was not quoted for more than two centuries after Josephus had published his work on Jewish Antiquities.* To this it is replied: Is it necessary that a given passage shall have been quoted at all in order to verify its authenticity? Citations clearly prove the existence of the original documents, but silence proves nothing. Tacitus, the greatest of Roman historians, who wrote about A. D. 110, is not cited for the first two hundred years. Thucydides, the greatest of the Greek historians, who wrote B. C. 470-403, is said not to have been quoted for the first five hundred years! Both Thucydides and Herodotus wrote about the Romans, but neither mentions Rome, the old-world capital. Tacitus and Strabo (A. D. 18), both wrote of the Jews, but neither one mentions the Jewish sect known as the Essenes, though they are mentioned both by Josephus and also the Jew Philo. Does silence justify the belief that the Essenes did not exist? Eusebius, a friend and favorite of the Emperor Constantine, is silent respecting the death of Constantine's son named Crispus. Josephus, pre-eminently the Jewish historian, omits the edict of the Emperor Claudius which banished the Jews from Rome, although the circumstance is mentioned both by the Roman Suetonius and by Luke. Origen (248) refers to the fact that Josephus bore "witness to John as having been a Baptist," and adds: "Now this writer, although not a believer in Jesus as the Christ, in seeking after the cause of the fall of Jerusalem [A. D. 70], . . . ought to have said that the conspiracy against Jesus was the cause of these calamities befalling the people, since they put to death Christ, being prophesied of," etc. (*Origen contra Celsum*, Bk. i, c 47.) And again: "It is wonderful that he who had not received Jesus as the Christ, should ascribe such righteousness to James," the Lord's brother. (*Commentary on Matthew x, 17.*) Now the curious question is legitimated: *How is it that Origen should repeatedly to Josephus's opinion of Jesus Christ, if Josephus had never written any opinion whatever about Jesus? That is to be accounted for.*

2. THE PASSAGE IS MOSTLY GENUINE, BUT PARTLY INTERPOLATED.

This position has been called a middle ground, and seems to be conceived in the desire of compromising the difficulty supposed. This view, however, is never accompanied by any facts to prove the historical character of the hypothesis. Gieseler thinks the passage "is regarded with the greatest probability as genuine, but interpolated." He brackets the following sentences as spurious, but offers no reason whatever for the support of his opinion, viz.: "If it be right to call Him a man"—"a teacher of such men as receive the truth with pleasure." . . . "He was the Christ"—"For he appeared again alive on the third day, the divine prophets declaring these things, and also ten thousand other wonderful things concerning him." These eliminations emasculate the paragraph of all its power, and what is left is not worth the place it occupies! Is it not strange, indeed, that so creditable a writer should take such liberties with an historical document, without a single fact

reason, or analogy to substantiate his proposition? We have no right to believe without reason, and we have no right to *disbelieve* when we have the sufficient reason. The opinions of great men are to be weighed and respected; but mere opinion carries no authority to the man who proposes to think for himself. Opinions are not evidence, and can not be substituted for evidence. Conclusions are too often the expression of inconsiderateness, conjecture, or merest prejudice, without fact or reason or investigation or probability to support them. It is a self-delusion to believe a given proposition because somebody else thinks so.

The late French infidel, Rénan, conceded much when he wrote of Josephus's references as follows: "His brief notices of John the Baptist and Judas the Gaulonite are dry and colorless. . . . *I think the passage on Jesus is authentic. It is perfectly in the style of Josephus; and if the historian had made mention of Jesus, it would have been in that way.*" (*Life of Jesus*, Introd. p. 13.)

3. THE PASSAGE IN ITS ENTIRETY IS GENUINE.

So say Brethschneider, Hauteville, Schedel, Oberthür, Whiston, Bömert, and Böttger, so far as distinguished opinions go. The chief reasons for this conclusion are these:

1. *All known manuscripts and versions of Josephus's works, without an exception, contain this testimony respecting Jesus.* (See Schaff, *Hist. Ch. Church*, Vol. I, p. 92, 2d edition; also his *Person of Christ*, p. 191, note.) Now, the presence of this famous passage in every existing copy of his works, in every language in which it is found, is a powerful authenticative evidence as an historical evidence on an historical question, which, with nothing in opposition, compels belief. The answer is complete. Demand can go no further. No fact in history can offer a better testimony. This fact must be refuted or the case is conclusive in itself. The burden of proof logically falls to the part of the objector to the authenticity of the passage. The reply to this is that "some Christian hand did the interpolating in multiplying copies." But what is the proof of the proposition? Without the evidence to substantiate the claim, it is offering the merest conjecture as proof, which is inadmissible. It is an historical question, and it must be treated in an historical manner. Conjectures are not facts, and can not be substituted for facts. The New Testament was also copied by Christian hands; but does *that* legitimate the belief that they vitiated the integrity of those Scriptures? Eusebius (A. D. 315) cites this passage of Josephus twice, without the suspicion that it was in any wise spurious. It had never been questioned. Not only so, but between A. D. 315 and 1440, no less than twenty-two writers of reputation, mostly historical, cite this passage as being universally considered unquestioned and unquestionable. (See Whiston's *Josephus*, App. 827-832.)

2. *It is in accordance with the style of Josephus.* The internal evidence of Josephus's authorship is one of the very strongest proofs pos-

sible; a point which seems to have been overlooked in the particular referred to. His characteristic manner of expression is found in this paragraph, and of itself is conclusive of its genuineness. A favorite and familiar formula of expression with this author when conveying the idea of a multitude, is "*many ten thousand*" or a phrasing closely resembling it. A few instances taken from Josephus's *Antiquities*, and also his *Roman-Jewish Wars*, gathered with very little research—by no means exhaustive—will amply illustrate the characteristic expression which finds place in the paragraph under consideration. Thus we read:

1. Though he [Herod] were encompassed with *ten thousand dangers.*" (*Ant.* Bk. xvii, c. 8, § 1.)
2. "For there were not a few *ten thousands* of this people." (*Ib.* xv, 3, 1.)
3. "A great many *ten thousands of people got together.*" (*Ib.* xvii, 10, 2.)
4. "At this time were *ten thousand* other disorders in Judæa." (*Ib.* xvii, 10, 4.)
5. "A great many *ten thousands* of Jews met Petronius." (*Ib.* xviii, 8, 3.)
6. "There came many *ten thousands* of Jews to Petronius." (*Ib.* xviii, 8, 2.)
7. "Jews . . . who came many *ten thousands in number.*" (*Ib.* xviii, 9, 5.)
8. "I sent him . . . many *ten thousands* [Cori] of corn." (*Wars*, i, 20, 1.)
9. "They were now become *many ten thousands of armed men.*" (*Ib.* ii, 21, 7.)
10. "Till *ten thousand men on the Jews' side lay dead.*" (*Ib.* iii, 2, 2.)
11. "Which had so many *ten thousands of men to fight for it.*" (*Ib.* vii, 8, 7.)
12. "The Romans . . . were thus destroying *ten thousand* several ways." (*Ib.* vii, 3, 1.)
13. John "filled the country with *ten thousand instances of wickedness.*" (*Ib.* vii, 8, 1.)
14. "The divine prophets had foretold these and *ten thousand other wonderful things concerning Him*" [viz., Christ]. (*Antiq.* xviii, 3, 3.)

Here are no less than *fourteen characteristic* expressions of Josephus scattered through *two* of his greatest literary works—too many instances to be considered merely accidental; are all these, therefore, inconclusive of his authorship? The phrase "*ten thousand,*" etc., which occurs also in this disputed paragraph respecting Christ and his crucifixion, is *internal evidence* of the genuineness of the passage. Can a parallel be found in any *two productions* of any *one man*, of equal antiquity, and the case be *spurious*? The writer evidences his authorship with ingrain certi-

tude. The citations above of the characteristic language of Josephus's authorship are too obvious to be overlooked, too numerous to be accidental, too identifying to be reasonably denied. In the light of such proof can any thoughtful and candid mind rest in the conviction that this famous passage is *not* genuine? Can any substantial reason be adduced to prove that it is an interpolation? One's own preconception or prejudice has no right to a place in such investigation. The mere opinions of others, without the reasons given, can not weigh in critical inquiry. For why should one man believe a proposition merely because somebody else thinks so?

The claim is sometimes assumed that such testimony of Jesus Christ is too Christian to come from a Jew. But is such assumption an open criticism seeking for fact and truth? An *à priori* judgment is not the way of sound reasoning, but forestalls it. Moreover, if this sentence be admitted as authentic, it necessitates the admission of that which precedes it, upon which it depends. Josephus is giving a reason for the continued loyalty of Christ's disciples, after the terrible discouragement induced by his crucifixion. He says: "*Those having loved him at the first did not cease [their affection]. For he appeared to them alive again on the third day, the divine prophets having proclaimed both these things, and also ten thousand other wonderful things respecting him.*"

Evidently the admission of Christ's resurrection in itself legitimates the admissibility of the fact that "he was the Christ." In the Jewish sense this was merely claiming that Jesus was the real Messiah of the Jews, with all the temporal aspects involved in the expectations of that people at that period.

In writing a *history of the Jews*, what sufficient reason can be assigned why Josephus did *not* mention Jesus? Would it not have been even more wonderful if he had so absolutely ignored him in view of his life and work? Is it rational to conclude that an historian as reliable as he, could and did neglect or purposely omitted to mention Jesus Christ, who of all men was THE MAN OF HISTORY? Yet this is precisely what Josephus did, if these two references (*Ant.*, xvii; 3, 3, and xx, 9, 1), which some have held in dispute, are to be considered as spurious. Yet the father of Josephus was the contemporary of Jesus. Marvelous it would have been if neither that father nor others of Jerusalem had never mentioned the name and fame of that great Teacher and Miracle-worker, whose brief life and countless deeds had wrought such a powerful impression in the land and for all time? It would indeed be more than unaccountable that so distinguished an historian should *not* have one word to say of that ONE OF ALL HISTORY who had stirred his generation and nation from center to circumference, who revolutionized the religious world, and changed the course of human history, and who for two thousand years since has filled the centuries with his imperishable power and fame! Who, with-

out a single historical proof to sustain the assumption, and without any reason that is conclusive and rational, can believe this in the face of the internal evidence cited? For the question of *interpolation* in this case can not be considered settled by mere conjectures, or by taking counsel of one's private prejudices. The burden of proof is upon the one who holds this section to be spurious. *It must be proved, not assumed* without proof. If one fail in furnishing the requisite historical facts, and in his reasoning on those facts, his proposition must be set down "*not proved.*" He must withal critically refute the reasons here assigned for the contrary belief.

Here the argument for the genuineness and authenticity of this passage of Josephus is closed. It is left with the reader to use his own judgment whether he accepts or omits the testimony of Josephus respecting Jesus Christ. His testimony really relates to three personages who are conspicuously named in the New Testament, namely:

- a) John the Baptist. (*Ant.* xviii, 5, 2).
- b) James the brother of our Lord. (*Ant.* xx, 9, 1).
- c) Jesus Christ. (*Ant.* xviii, 3, 3).

EXCURSUS B.

EPISTLE OF PLINY TO THE EMPEROR TRAJAN.

"C. PLINIUS TRAJANO IMP. S.:-

"Health, Sire! It is my custom to refer to you all things about which I am in doubt. For who is more capable of directing my hesitation or instructing my ignorance?

"I have never been present at any trials of the Christians; consequently, I do not know what is the nature of the crimes, or the usual strictness of their examination, or the severity of their punishment. I have hesitated not a little, whether any distinction was to be made in respect to age; or whether those of tender years were to be treated the same as adults; or whether repentance entitles them to pardon; or whether it shall avail nothing for him who has been a Christian to renounce his error; whether the name itself, even without any crime, should be subject to punishment, or only the crimes connected with the name. In the meantime I have pursued this course toward those who have been brought before me as Christians. I asked them whether they were Christians; if they confessed [that they were], I repeated the question the second and a third time, adding threats of punishment. If they still persevered, I ordered them to be led away to punishment; for I could not doubt, whatever the nature of their profession might be, that a stubborn and unyielding obstinacy certainly deserved to be punished [with death]. There were others also under like infatuation; but as they were Roman citizens, I directed them to be sent to the capital.

“But the crime spread as is wont to happen even while the prosecutions were going on, and numerous instances presented themselves. An information was presented to me without any name subscribed, accusing a large number of persons who denied that they were Christians, or ever had been. They repeated after me an invocation of the gods, and made offerings with frankincense and wine before your statue, which I had ordered to be brought in for this purpose, together with the images of the gods; and, moreover, they reviled Christ; whereas those who are truly Christians, it is said, can not be forced to do any of these things. I thought, therefore, that they ought to be discharged. Others who were accused by a witness confessed that they were Christians, but afterwards denied it. Some owned that they had been Christians, but said that they had renounced their error some three years before; others more; and a few even so long ago as twenty years. They all did homage to your statue and the images of the gods, and at the same time reviled the name of Christ. They declared that the whole of their guilt or error was that they were accustomed to meet on a stated day [stato die] before it was light and sing in a concert* praise to Christ as God, and to bind themselves by an oath,† not for the perpetration of any wickedness, but that they would not commit any theft, robbery, or adultery, or violate their word, nor refuse, when called upon, to restore anything committed to their trust. After this, they were accustomed to separate, and then reassemble to eat in common a harmless meal. Even this they ceased to do after my edict, in which, agreeable to your commands, I forbade the meeting of secret assemblies.

“After hearing this, I thought it the more necessary to endeavor to find out the truth, by putting to torture two female slaves called deaconesses. But I could discover nothing but a perverse and extravagant superstition; and therefore I deferred all further proceedings until I should consult with you. For the matter appears to me worthy of such consultation, especially on account of the number of those who are involved in peril. For many of every age, of every rank, and of either sex, are exposed and will be exposed to danger. Nor has the contagion of the superstition been confined to the cities, but it has extended to the villages, and even to the country. Nevertheless, it still seems possible to arrest the evil and apply the remedy. At least it is evident that the temples, which had been deserted, begin to be frequented and the sacred solemnities so long interrupted are again revived; and the victims, which heretofore could hardly find a purchaser, are now everywhere in demand. From this it is easy to imagine what a multitude of men might be reclaimed, if pardon should be offered to those who repent.”

*Secum invicem = “alternately,” perhaps responsive singing unto Christ.

†Sacramentum = a Roman oath of allegiance; secondly, religiously, an obligation of loyalty to Christ.

EXCURSUS C.

THE LOGIA OF OUR LORD; OR, "THE SAYINGS OF JESUS."

This is the title given to the fragment of an ancient document whose date is placed at A. D. 100-150. It consists of a brief and fragile leaf belonging to a book purporting to contain Christ's sayings in his ministry on earth. The single leaf measures three and three-fourths by five and three-fourths inches, but is broken off at the foot of the page. It was written on papyrus, and bears the ancient marks of contraction in certain Greek words, such as characterize Biblical manuscripts of very early date, such as TO ANOC OC , and an occasional N , represented by a horizontal stroke above the final letter.

This fragment was very recently discovered, along with many other Greek manuscripts, on the edge of the Libyan or Western Desert, on the banks of Joseph's River ("Bahr Yusuf"), about seven miles from the River Nile, in one of a series of low mounds, on the site of an ancient city called Oxyrhynchus, whose ruins are now in part occupied by a squalid village of a few huts known as Behesa. It was found by two young men named A. S. Hunt and Bernard P. Grenfell, both graduates and Fellows of the University of Oxford, in England, whose researches for antiquities were conducted under the general direction of Professor Petrie.

Upon the internal evidence of the document, some critics date this fragment as early as A. D. 140; others, by reason of its archaic expression and characteristic framework, place it at the beginning of the second century. Its real antiquity as yet can not be fully determined. But if the latter hypothesis should prove to be the correct date, it brings the chronology of the document within touch of the Apostolic Age, and within about a half century of the publication of the Synoptic Gospels, and still nearer to the writing of John's Gospel. Among the seven sayings of Jesus is one which does not seem to be in harmony with our Lord's teachings as recorded by the Evangelists. It is that which relates to the observance of the Sabbath. Nevertheless, in all other respects these *Logia* are of great evidential value as serving to authenticate both the antiquity and credibility of the Gospels, being a profane document from an independent source. They appear to be *Memorabilia* of the life of Jesus; for without the historical Christ there would be no accounting for the origin of these "Sayings."

It should especially be remarked that John opens both his Gospel and his First Epistle by designating Jesus by the Greek word *Logos* ($\Delta\acute{\lambda}\omicron\gamma\omicron\varsigma$), which in both of our versions is rendered "Word:" "In the beginning was the Word;" "The Word was made [became] flesh;" "The Word of Life." The four Gospels do not assume to give us all the sayings of Christ. Indeed, John expressly disclaims doing so (Gospel, xxi, 25); and Paul makes a citation of Christ's words which are not

found in the Gospels at all when he says: "*Remember the words of the Lord Jesus how he said, It is more blessed to give than to receive.*" (Acts xx, 35.)

Scholars will be pleased to see a copy of the Greek text of this fragment so far as it has proved to be decipherable, and the translation of the same is herewith subjoined. The dots and brackets indicate the omissions which occur in the text.

1. . . . καὶ τότε διαβλέψεις ἐκβαλεῖν τὸ κάρφος τὸ ἐν τῷ ὀφθαλμῷ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ σου.

. . . 'and then shalt thou see clearly to cast out the mote that is in thy brother's eye.'

2. Λέγει Ἰησοῦς· ἐὰν μὴ νηστεύσητε τὸν κόσμον οὐ μὴ εὕρητε τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ· καὶ ἐὰν μὴ σαββατίσητε τὸ σάββατον οὐκ ὄψεσθε τὸν πατέρα.

'Jesus saith, Except ye fast to the world, ye shall in no wise find the kingdom of God; and except ye keep the sabbath, ye shall not see the Father.'

3. Λέγει Ἰησοῦς· ἔ[σ]την ἐν μέσῳ τοῦ κόσμου, καὶ ἐν σαρκὶ ὤφθην αὐτοῖς, καὶ εὔρον πάντας μεθύοντας καὶ οὐδένα εὔρον διψῶντα ἐν αὐτοῖς, καὶ πονεῖ ἡ ψυχὴ μου ἐπὶ τοῖς υἱοῖς τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ὅτι τυφλοὶ εἰσιν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτῶ[ν].

'Jesus saith, I stood in the midst of the world, and in the flesh was I seen of them, and I found all men drunken, and none found I athirst among them, and my soul grieveth over the sons of men, because the are blind in their heart.'

4. . . . τὴν πτωχείαν. . . .

. . . 'the poverty. . . .

5. [Λέγ]ει [Ἰησοῦς· ὅπ]ου ἐὰν ὦσιν [. . .]ε[. . .] . . . θεοὶ καὶ [. . .]σο . . . ε[. . .] ἔστιν ὁ μόνος [. . .]τω ἐγὼ εἰμὶ μετ' αὐτ[οῦ] ἔγει[ρον] τὸν λίθον ἀκεῖ εὐρήσεις με, σχίσον τὸ ξύλον καὶ γὰρ ἐκεῖ εἰμὶ.

'Jesus saith, Wherever there are . . . and there is one . . . alone, I am with him. Raise the stone and there thou shalt find me; cleave the wood, and there I am.'

6. Λέγει Ἰησοῦς· οὐκ ἔστιν δεκτὸς προφήτης ἐν τῇ πατρίδι αὐτ[ο]ῦ, οὐδὲ ἰατρὸς ποιεῖ θεραπείας εἰς τοὺς γινώσκοντας αὐτόν.

'Jesus saith, A prophet is not acceptable in his own country, neither doth a physician work cures upon them that know him.'

7. Λέγει Ἰησοῦς· πόλις ὠκοδομημένη ἐπ' ἄκρον [ὄ]ρους ὑψηλοῦ καὶ ἐστηρικμένη οὔτε πε[σ]εῖν δύναται οὔτε κρυ[β]ῆναι.

'Jesus saith, A city built on the top of a hill and established, can neither fall nor be hid.'

EXCURSUS D.

DIDACHÉ; OR, THE TEACHING OF THE TWELVE APOSTLES.

This recently-discovered and famous writing was written in Hellenistic Greek, as were the New Testament and the Septuagint of the Old Testament. It is believed to have been written in Syria or Palestine. The subject-matter of the manuscript was first announced in 1875, and in 1883 it was given to the world printed in complete form by the dis-

coverer, the distinguished scholar and prelate, Bryennios, then metropolitan of Seræ, now of Nicomedia. The original writer is unknown. The document was found in what is known as the Jerusalem manuscript, in the library of Constantinople. This copy was made in A. D. 1056; but, in the judgment of the critics, the original was written A. D. 70-100, with a strong probability of 70-79. In 1884, Hilgenfeld issued his *Novum Testamentum* along with this manuscript, with critical emendations (Leipsic, iv, 94-103).

The *Didaché* bears a twofold title. The briefer one is the *Teaching*, but a more descriptive title is *The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*, (Διδαχὴ τῶν δώδεκα Ἀποστόλων). The opening sentence of the document reads: "Teaching of the Lord by the Twelve Apostles to the Nations" (ΔΙΔΑΧΗ Κυρίου διὰ τῶν δώδεκα Ἀποστόλων τοῖς ἔθνεσιν). There is no claim for inspiration in this writing, or that it was a part of the Scriptures of the New Testament. Rather it is a summary of the apostolic teachings, intended to be used in the catechetical instruction of converts by the successors of the apostles. It is concededly identical with the work mentioned by Eusebius and Athanasius, and cited by Clement of Alexandria. It very much resembles the Epistle of Barnabas (not the Apostolic Father), with which the manuscript was connected when discovered, and it is of the same chronology. It contains sixteen chapters, nearly half of which relates to *The Two Ways*; the remainder referring to rites and orders in the Church, and to sacred occasions and observances related thereto, directions about the mode of baptism, formulæ respecting the Eucharist, words about the Lord's Day, the Christian apostles and prophets, and it enjoins also a careful watchfulness for the Second Coming of Christ.

Dr. Salmon, professor in the University at Dublin, remarks: "This work bears every mark of a great antiquity, and it is commonly accepted as belonging to the beginning of the second century, if not the latter part of the first." (*Introd. N. T.* 5th ed. 1891, p. 555.) Bishop Lightfoot says: "The archaic simplicity of its practical suggestions . . . point to the first or the beginning of the second century as the date of the work." (*Apos. Fathers*, ed. 1891, p. 216.) Dr. Schaff adds: "*Didaché* is no modern or ancient forgery, but has every internal evidence of great antiquity and genuineness." "It has the highest marks of antiquity. . . . There is nothing in it which could not have been written between A. D. 70 and 100." (*Teaching of Twelve Apostles*, pp. 114, 119, 122.)

EXCURSUS E.

THE MURATORIAN CANON.

This fragment is so called from the name of its discoverer, *Muratorius*, an Italian. It was originally found in Bobbio in the monastery, and thence was carried to Milan and placed in the Ambrosian Library, where, after being for a long time lost to sight, it was discovered. This

copy was made about the seventh or eighth century, but the original was composed about the middle of the second Christian century. At the beginning and the end, this manuscript is considerably disfigured by the transcriber. It is written in Latin, but unquestionably it is a translation from the Greek. Nevertheless, it is a document of the highest interest and importance. It is also much mutilated at the beginning and the ending. In its present form several of the first leaves are missing, and the fragment begins with the last words of a sentence evidently taken from Mark's Gospel. It then mentions Luke's Gospel as being third in order, having been written by Luke the physician, the companion of Paul. It distinctly assigns the fourth Gospel to John, who is expressly named as "a disciple of the Lord."

Its authorship is unknown. Bunsen attributed it to Hegesippus, the earliest Church historian, whose work, except a fragment, has perished. But there is nothing in the internal evidence to determine who the writer was, and the assigning it to any person is merely a shrewd guess.

Dr. Westcott claims for the fragment a very high authority, and says that its composition can not be placed much later than A. D. 170. He says: "The internal evidence fully confirms its claim to this high antiquity; and it may be regarded on the whole as a summary of the opinion of the Western Church on the Canon, shortly after the middle of the second century."

Acts follows the Gospels; the thirteen Pauline Epistles are referred to that apostle as their author. Nine are addressed to the Churches, and four to individuals in the Church. Of Paul it is said that he "wrote by name only to seven Churches, showing thereby the unity of the general Church; though he wrote twice to the Corinthians and Thessalonians for their correction." "He wrote at greater length first to the Corinthians to forbid heretical schism; afterwards to the Galatians to put a stop to circumcision; then to the Romans, according to the rule of the [Old Testament] Scriptures, showing at the same time that Christ was the foundation of them." He also mentions "an Epistle to Philemon, one to Titus, and two to Timothy." "First Peter, and First John and the Epistle of James, Second Peter, and the Epistle to the Hebrews, are all omitted; but, with these exceptions, every book in our New Testament Canon is acknowledged." (Westcott, *Canon*, pp. 212, 217-219.)

EXCURSUS F.

THE EXPURGATED EDITIONS OF THE JEWISH TALMUD.

In A. D. 1240 a conference was held at Paris between the Jewish Rabbins on the one part, and Nicolaus Donin on the other, in regard to certain blasphemies and opprobrious epithets recorded against Jesus of Nazareth and his mother, Mary the Virgin. These things had long been taught to the Jewish youth. The chief of the Rabbins, whose name was

Jechiel, would not admit that the Jesus there referred to was the "Jesus of Nazareth," but affirmed that the opprobrious language of the Talmud then existing was meant to apply to another bearing the same name! This discovery was the more remarkable inasmuch as the Rabbi could not designate the "other" Jesus as the distinguished personage. Dr. Levin, himself a Jew, in a prize essay remarks: "*We must regard the attempt of F. Jechiel to ascertain that there were two by the name of Jesus as unfortunate, original as the idea may be!*" However, the result of this conference was, that "the Talmud in wagon-loads was burned at Paris in A. D. 1242." These highly offensive passages were thereupon *expunged from the Talmud, the last unexpurgated edition dating at Amsterdam in 1645.* The expurgation was done under an edict published by the Jewish elders in Council, convened in Poland in 1631, or A. M. 5391.

THE EDICT.

"Great peace to our beloved brethren of the House of Israel: Having received information that many Christians have applied themselves with care to acquire the knowledge of the language in which our books were written, we therefore enjoin upon you, *under the penalty of the Great Ban (to be inflicted upon such of you as shall transgress this our statute)*, that you do not in any new editions of the Mishna or Gemára publish anything relative to *Jesus of Nazareth*; and you take special care not to write anything concerning him, good or bad; so that neither ourselves nor our religion be exposed to any injury. For we know what those men of Belial, the Murim [*i. e.*, "*Heretics*"], have done to us when they became Christians, and how their representatives against us have obtained credit. Therefore let us make you cautious.

"If you should not pay strict attention to this our letter, but act contrary thereto, and *continue to publish our books in the same way as before*, you will occasion both to us and yourselves greater afflictions than we have hitherto experienced, and be the means of our being compelled to embrace the Christian religion as we were formerly; and thus our latter troubles be worse than the former. For these reasons we command you that if you publish any new editions of these books, let the places relating to Jesus the Nazarene be left blank, and fill the space with a circle like this: O. But the Rabbins and teachers of the children well know how to instruct the youth by the word of mouth. Then Christians will no longer have anything to show against us upon this subject, and we may expect deliverance from the afflictions we have heretofore labored under, and reasonably hope to live in peace." (See C. Leslie's *Short and Easy Method with the Jews*, p. 2, *et seq.*, London, 1812, in which the Hebrew and the English translation appear side by side; also McClintock and Strong's *Cyclop.* x, 172; also Rabbi Joseph S. C. F. Frey's *Messiahship of Jesus*, 1850, pp. 123, 124; also his *Joseph and Benjamin*, 9th ed., Vol. I, p. 238.)

In the unexpurgated editions of the Talmud the name of Jesus occurs about twenty times. Besides being named Jesus, he is often covertly

referred to in terms of disguise, and in a manner marked with malignity illustrative of the ancient spirit which crucified him. Among those opprobrious epithets are the designation "Absalom;" "Ben Stada," *i. e.*, the son of Stada; "Ben Pandira, *i. e.*, either scourge or ravenous lust, meaning the son of adultery; "A certain one," פְּלוֹנִי = ὁ δέινα, "He whom we may not name;" "The Nazarene;" "The Fool;" "The Hung" upon the cross,—cf. Acts v, 30, and x, 39. Hence Abn Ezra remarks, under Gen. xxvii, 39, that Constantine the Great, the first Christian emperor, "placed the figure of The Hung" upon his standard; and Rabbi Bechal, on Psalms lxxx, 14, says: "Behold and visit this vine, adding that in the word קַיִלֵּר, the Hebrew letter y is suspended to indicate that those who ruin the vineyard [the Christians] are the worshipers of The Hung." But more and worse than this is the substituting Hebrew letters for the Greek form of Christ's name (Ἰησοῦς, *Jesus*), from which they construct a word taking each letter as an initial, the several words composing a sentence to this effect: "May his memory (י) be destroyed (י), and his name (ש) be blotted out (י)." (See Farrar's *Life of Christ*, Vol. II, 452, 453.)

"The name was ישׁי [Jesus] in order that it might sound peculiar to the people, so as to cause them to spy out his words and deeds, and to search out his progenitor. Thus it would become known that he was regarded as illegitimate by the Jewish sages who had bestowed upon him the name Jeshu designedly; because the three letters of which it is composed (Yomokh, Shema, Vazikho) means: "May his name be defamed and obliterated!" (*Toledoth Jeshu Ha Nassri.*)

EXCURSUS G.

EXTRACTS FROM THE TOLEDOTH JESHU.

[These extracts are taken from S. Baring-Gould's work bearing the title, *The Lost and Hostile Gospels* (London, 1874), embodying Wagen-seil's refutation of the original book called the *Toledoth Jeshu* ("History of Jesus"), issued in A. D. 1681, and Huldreich's translation of the same under the title, *Historia Jeshuæ Nazareni* (Leyden, 1705). The original *Toledoth Jeshu* was translated years ago into English by a London Jew, a bookseller, under the title, *The Gospel According to the Jews*, in the stupid supposition that the book would make against Christianity!]

1. *Mother of Jesus.* "In the Year of the World 4671, in the days of King Jannæus, a great misfortune befell Israel. There arose at that time a scapegrace, a wastrel and worthless fellow, of the fallen race of Judah, named Joseph Pandira. He was a well-built man, strong and handsome, but he spent his time in robbery and violence. His dwelling was at Bethlehem, in Juda. And there lived near him a widow and her daughter, whose name was Mirjam [Mary]; and this is the same Mirjam who dressed and curled women's hair, who is mentioned several times in the Talmud."

This author dates the birth of Jesus, according to the Talmud, in the reign of Alexander Jannæus, who reigned 106-79 B. C. Reckoning by Jewish count from the creation of the world, he names the year 4671 (910 B. C.). In opprobrious terms he represents our Lord as the illegitimate child of this Pandira and Mary, whose name was Joshua, after his uncle, and was given to Rabbi Elchanan to be instructed in the law; that this Jeshu (Jesus), when a boy, for not uncovering his head and bowing his knee in the presence of some Sanhedrists, was expelled from the Temple under a blast of three hundred trumpets, and went to Galilee, where he spent several years! Mary is represented as being a marvelously beautiful woman, whose *death* is thus mentioned:

“Not long after this, King Herod died, and was succeeded by his son in the kingdom of Israel. But when he had obtained the throne, he heard that the people of Ai had made images in honor of Jesus and Mary, and he wrote letters to Ai and ordered their destruction. . . . When the people of Ai saw that there was no help, they burned the images and bound themselves before the sons of Israel. And about this time Mirjam, the mother of Jeshu died. Then the king ordered that she should be buried at the foot of the tree on which Jeshu had hung; and there he also had the brothers and sisters of Jeshu hung up. And they were hung, and a memorial stone was set up on the spot. But the worthless men, their kinsmen, came and destroyed the memorial stone, and set up another in its stead, on which they wrote the words: ‘Lo! this is the ladder set upon the earth, whose head reaches to heaven, and the angels of God ascend and descend upon it, and the mother rejoices here in her children. Allelujah!’ Now, when the king heard this, he destroyed the memorial they had erected, and killed a hundred of the kindred of Jeshu.”

2. *Birth of Christ.* The text of Huldreich relates that Jesus spent many years in Egypt, the headquarters of those who practiced *the art of magic*; that having learned the art, he went to Galilee, proclaiming himself the Creator of the world, born of a virgin according to the prediction of Isaiah vii, 14; and was ready to prove his mission to the people by working miracles. On another occasion, when the Jews sought to slay Jesus,—

“The Fatherless One answered: ‘Did not Isaiah prophesy of me? And my father David, did he not speak of me? The Lord said unto me, Thou art my son; this day have I begotten thee. Desire of me, and I will give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost part of the earth for thy possession. Thou shalt rule them with a rod of iron, and break them in pieces like a potter’s vessel.’ And in like manner he speaks in another place: ‘The Lord said unto my Lord: Sit thou on my right hand, till I make thine enemies my footstool! And now, behold! I will

ascend to my heavenly Father, and sit me down at his right hand.'” “About this time Jeshu assembled the inhabitants about him and wrought many miracles, . . . and cried: ‘I am God, the son of God, born of my mother by the power of the Holy Ghost, and sprang from her virginal brow.’”

3. *Flight into Egypt.* According to the Wagenseil text, Mirjam, or Mary, was betrothed to one Jochanan, and resided at Bethlehem; in the Huldreich text, she was married to Joseph Pandira, and lived in Jerusalem. She was of the tribe of Benjamin! After many years, the home of Mirjam and Joseph Pandira, in Bethlehem, became known to Herod, who sent orders for their arrest and for the massacre of the children; but Joseph who had been forewarned by a kinsman in the court of Herod, fled with his wife and children into Egypt. The story relates further that after many years, because of a famine in Egypt, Joseph and Mirjam with Jeshu and his brethren returned to Canaan and resided in Nazareth.

4. *Jesus wrought Miracles.* According to Huldreich’s text, our Lord learned magic in Egypt, and practiced it as miracles in Judæa; but according to the text of Wagenseil, the following was the origin of Christ’s miraculous power:

“Now at this time the unutterable Name of God [*i. e.*, יהוה] Jehovah] was engraved in the Temple on the corner-stone. For when King David dug the foundations, he found there a stone in the ground on which the Name of God was engraved, and took it and placed it in the Holy of Holies. But as the wise men feared lest some inquisitive youth should learn this Name, and be able thereby to destroy the world—which God advert!—they made by magic two brazen lions, which they set before the entrance of the Holy of Holies, one on the right, the other on the left. Now, if any one were to go in, and learn the Holy Name, then the lions would begin to roar as he came out, so that out of alarm and bewilderment, he would lose his presence of mind, and forget the Name.

“And Jeshu left Upper Galilee, and came secretly to Jerusalem, and went into the temple, and there learned the holy writing; and after he had written the incommunicable Name on parchment, he uttered it with the intent that he might feel no pain, and then cut into his flesh, and hid the parchment with the inscription therein. Then he uttered the Name once more, and made so that his flesh healed up again. And when he went to the door the lions roared, and he forgot the Name. Therefore he hastened outside the town, cut into his flesh, took the writing out, and when he had sufficiently studied the signs, he retained the Name in his memory.”

The Huldreich text teaches that Jesus learned *magic* in Egypt which in Palestine he palmed off as *miracles*. In Wagenseil's edition he surreptitiously obtained and wrought miracles by using the sacred Name of Jehovah, which could be spoken only by the high priest once a year, on the great Day of Atonement. The story in the Jew's Talmud says that he obtained miraculous power by bringing out of Egypt, secretly cut on the skin, the magical arts there privately taught! Such silly absurdities refute themselves. The story proceeds to say that Jesus said:

“Bring me here a dead man, and I will restore him to life.’ Then all the people hastened and dug into a grave, but found nothing in it but bones. . . . He said: ‘Bring them hither to me.’ So when they had brought them, he placed the bones together, and surrounded them with skin and flesh and muscles, so that the dead man stood up alive on his feet. And when the people saw this, they wondered greatly. And he said: ‘Do ye marvel at this that I have done? Bring hither a leper, and I will heal him.’ So when they had placed a leper before him, he gave him health in like manner, by means of the incommunicable Name. And all the people that saw this fell down before him, prayed to him and said, ‘Truly thou art the Son of God.’

“But after five days the report of what had been done, came to Jerusalem, and all was related that Jeshu had wrought in Galilee. Then all the people rejoiced greatly; but the elders, the pious men, and the company of the wise men wept bitterly. And the great and the little mourned, and at length agreed that they would send a deputation to him; for they thought that perhaps, with God's help, they might overpower him and bring him to judgment, and *condemn him to death*. Therefore they sent unto him Ananias and Achasias, the noblest men of the little council; and when they had come to him, they bowed themselves before him reverently in order to deceive him as to their purpose. And he, thinking that they believed in him, received them with a smiling countenance, and placed them in his assembly of profigates.”

5. *Jesus and His Disciples*. According to Huldreich's edition of the *Toledoth Jeshu*, Jeshu gathered about him many disciples, whose names were “Simon and Matthias, Elikus, Mardochai, and Thoda, whose names Jeshu changed. He called Simon Peter, after the word Petrus, which in Hebrew signifies the First. And Matthias he called Matthew; and Elikus he called Luke, because he sent him forth among the heathen [Luke x, 1-14]; and Mardochai he named Mark, because he said, ‘Vain men come unto me.’ And Thoda he called Pahul [Paul], because he bore witness of him. Another worthless fellow also joined them, named Jochanan, and he changed his name to Jahannus [probably a corruption of

Johanau, *i. e.*, John], on account of the miracles Jeshu wrought through him, by means of the incommunicable Name. This Jahannus advised that all the men who were together should have their heads washed with the water Boleth, that the hair might not grow on them, and all the world might know that they were Nazarenes. But the affair was known to the elders and to the king. Then he sent his messengers to take Jeshu and his disciples, to bring them to Jerusalem. But out of fear of the people, they gave timely warning to Jeshu that the king sought to take and kill him and his companions. Therefore they fled into the desert of Ai [Capernaum?] (Luke xiii, 31-33.) And when the servants of the king came and found them not, with the exception of Jahannus, they took him and led him before the king. And the king ordered that Jahannus should be executed with the sword. The servants of the king therefore went at his command and slew Jahannus, and hung up his head at the gate of Jerusalem." [Here is an obvious confounding of John the Baptist with John the disciple.]

"There grew to be a strife between the Nazarenes and the Jews, . . . and the distress grew greater during thirty years. And the Nazarenes assembled in thousands and tens of thousands. And the belief of the opposition grew more and more, and spread on all sides. Also twelve godless runagates separated and traversed the twelve realms, and everywhere in the assemblies of the people uttered false prophecies. Also many Israelites adhered to them; and these were men of high renown, and they strengthened the faith in Jeshu. And because they gave themselves out to be messengers of him who was hung [in crucifixion], a great number followed them from among the Israelites.

"Now when the wise men saw the desperate condition of affairs, one said to another: 'Woe unto us! for we have deserved it through our sins.' And they sat in great distress, and wept, and looked up to heaven and prayed. And when they had ended their prayer, there rose up a very aged man of the elders, by name *Simon Cephas* [John i, 42], who understood prophecy; and he said to the others 'Hearken to me, my brethren! if ye will consent unto my advice, I will separate these wicked ones from the company of the Israelites, that they will have neither part nor lot with Israel. But the sin do ye take upon you.' Then answered they all and said, 'The sin be on us; declare unto us thy counsel and fulfill thy purpose.' Therefore Simon son of Cephas, went into the Holiest Place and wrote the incommunicable Name, and cut into his flesh and hid the parchment therein. And when he came forth out of the temple he took forth the writing; and when he had learned the Name, he betook himself to the chief city of the Nazarenes, and cried with a loud voice: 'Let all who believe in Jeshu come unto me, for I am sent by him to you!'

Then there came unto him multitudes as the sand on the seashore, and they said to him: 'Show us a sign that thou art sent!' And he said: 'What sign?' They answered him: 'Even the signs that Jeshu wrought when he was alive.'" [Thereupon Simon Peter heals a leper, and restores a dead man to life. Then the people adhered to him as having been sent by Jeshu. This seems to be a confounding of Peter with Simon Magus, mentioned in Acts viii, 9-24.]

"Then said Simon Cephas to them: 'Yea, verily Jeshu did send me to you, and now swear unto me that ye will obey me in all things that I command.' And they all swore to him: 'We will do all things that thou commandest.' Then said Simon Cephas: Ye know that he who was hung [upon the cross] was an enemy to the Israelites and the Law, because of the prophecy of Isaiah [i, 14], Your new moons and festivals my soul hateth. And that he had no pleasure in the Israelites, according to the saying of Hosea [i, 9], Ye are not my people. Now, although it is in my power to blot them in the twinkling of an eye from off the face of the earth, yet will he not root them out, but will keep them ever in the midst of you as a witness of his stoning and hanging on a tree. He endured those pains and the punishment of death, to redeem your souls from hell. And now he warns and commands you to do no harm to the Jew. Yea, even should a Jew say to a Nazarene, Go with me a mile, he shall go with him twain; or should a Nazarene be smitten by a Jew on one cheek, let him turn to him the other also [Matt. v, 39; Luke vi, 29], that the Jews may enjoy their good things; for in the world to come they must suffer their punishment in hell. If ye do these things then shall ye merit to sit with them [the apostles] on the thrones [Matt. xix, 28].'

"Then Simon said: 'I am Simon Ben Kalpus, uncle of Jeshu. Jeshu came and sent me unto you to teach you his law, for he is the Son of God. And lo! I will give you the law of Jesus, which is a new commandment.' Then he wrought before them signs and wonders. He also wrote books in the names of the disciples of Jeshu, and especially in that of Johannes [*John*], and said that Jeshu had given him these. But with special purpose he composed the Book of Johannes [Apocalypse or Revelation], for the men of Ai thought it contained mysteries, whereas it contained pure invention. For instance, he wrote in the Book of Johannes that Johannes saw a beast with seven heads and seven horns and seven crowns; and the name of the beast was Blasphemy, and the number of the beast was 666. [Rev. xii, 3; xiii, 1.]

"When, now, the elders and wise men heard of what was done, they came to the king and consulted him and his council. Then answered Judas, son of Zachar: 'I am the first of the king's princes; I will go myself and see if it be true what is said, that

this man blasphemeth.' After that *Judas* went to Jerusalem. . . . Now, when *Judas* was come to Jerusalem, he related to the king and the elders the words and deeds of *Jeshu*, and how, through the power of the incommunicable Name, he had wrought such wonders that the people of *Ai* believed on him. Then the king and the elders asked counsel of *Judas* how they might take *Jeshu* and his disciples."

6. *Conspiracy of Judas*. "Therefore, the wise men went forth with sad hearts, and one turned to another and said: 'Let us use subtlety, that we may get him into our hands.' And one said to another: 'If it seems right unto you, let one of us learn the Name as he [*Jeshu*] did, and work miracles, and perchance we shall secure him.' And this counsel pleased the elders; and they said: 'He who will learn the Name, and secure the *Fatherless One*, shall receive a double reward in the future life.' And thereupon one of the elders stood up, whose name was *Judas*, and he spake unto them saying: 'Are ye agreed to take upon you the blame of such action, if I speak the incommunicable Name? For if so, I will learn it, and it may happen that God in his mercy may bring the *Fatherless One* into my power.' Then they all cried out with one voice: 'The guilt be on us; but do thou make the effort and succeed.' Thereupon he went into the Holiest Place, and did what *Jeshu* had done." [Afterwards *Judas* is represented as working miracles by the use of the incommunicable Name, and in contest with *Jeshu*, *Judas* overcomes him, and the power of *Jeshu* leaves him, and he was subjected to the taunts of his captors, the elders.] "Now when the disciples saw this, and all the multitude of sinners who had followed him, they fought against the elders and the wise men of Jerusalem. and gave *Jeshu* opportunity to escape out of the city. And he hasted to the *Jordan*; and when he had washed therein, his power returned, and with the Name, he again wrought his former miracles. Thereafter he went and took two millstones and made them swim on the water; and he seated himself thereon, and caught fishes to feed the multitude that followed him."

7. *The Royal March*. [At length *Jesus* is invited by the deputation from Jerusalem headed by *Ananias* and *Achasias*, by deceit and treachery, to come to that city.] "And *Jeshu* said, I will go forthwith on my way! And it came to pass when he had come as far as *Nob*, nigh unto Jerusalem [a city near and in sight of Jerusalem, in the territory of Benjamin, by which the Assyrians approached the city mentioned in *Isa. x*, 28-32], that he said to his followers: 'Have ye here a good and comely ass?' They answered him that there was one even at hand. Therefore he said: 'Bring him hither to me.' And so a stately ass was brought unto him, and he sat upon it and rode into Jerusalem. And as *Jeshu* entered into the city, all the people went forth to meet him. Then he cried saying:

‘Of me did the prophet Zacharias testify, Behold thy King cometh unto thee, righteous and a Savior, poor and riding on an ass, and a colt the foal of an ass.’ [Compare Matt. xxi, 1-11; Mark xi, 1-11; Luke xix, 29-40; John xii, 12-16.] Now when they heard this, they all wept bitterly and rent their clothes.”

8. *Arrest of Jesus.* [Judas forewarns the elders of the Sanhedrin of Christ’s coming to Jerusalem, and on arriving and entering the temple, he is attacked by armed men. *Judas is identified as one of the disciples of Jeshu*; but the Jewish servants do not know him from being a disciple; so Judas casts himself down before Jeshu, and thus indicates to the armed men whom they are to capture. Some disciples offer resistance, but are readily overcome, and betake themselves to the mountains, where they are caught and killed.]

“But the elders of Jerusalem led Jeshu in chains into the city, and bound him to a marble pillar, and scourged him [Matt. xxvii, 26; John xix, 1], and said: ‘Where are now all the miracles thou hast wrought?’ And they plaited a crown of thorns, and set it on his head.” “But when the feast of the Passover drew nigh, it was heralded through all the land of Judæa that any one who had aught to say in favor, and for the exculpation of Jeshu, should declare it before the king.”

9. *Sentence of Jesus.* “Then they led Jeshu forth before the Greater and the Less Sanhedrin, and he was sentenced to be stoned, and then to be hung on a tree.” “Therefore, on the eve of the Passover, Jeshu was brought out of the prison; and they cried before him: ‘So may all thine enemies perish, O Lord!’” “And it was on the eve of the Passover* and of the Sabbath.”
10. *Crucifixion of Jesus.* “And they led him forth to the place where the punishment of stoning was wont to be executed, and they stoned him there till he was dead. And after that the wise men hung him on the tree; but no tree would bear him; each brake and yielded.” “And they hanged him on a tree outside of Jerusalem, as the king and elders of Jerusalem had commanded. And all Israel looked on and glorified God.”

*The Jewish Talmud, which is the basis of these two writings, states: “The tradition is, that on the eve of the Passover, Jesus, . . . the son of Mary, was hanged” [on a cross. Comp. Acts v, 30-33, and x, 39]. (*Babylonian Talmud, Tract Sanhedrin, fol. 43a.*) Again, “No defense could be found; therefore they hanged him upon the eve of the Passover.” (*Bab. Tal. Tract. Sanhedr. fol. 67a.*) And again, “But I say his mother was Stada; and they hanged him up on the eve of the Passover.” (*Bab. Tal. Sanhedr. 67a.*)

Thus the Jewish Talmud confesses to the following facts, viz.:

1. That the *Person* executed was no other than “*Jesus*.” “*The tradition is that Jesus, . . . the son of Mary.*”
2. That Jesus was *put to death by crucifixion*: “*That Jesus was hanged up.*”
3. That his crucifixion occurred at a known date: “*They hanged him up on the eve of the Passover.*”

11. *Incidents of the Crucifixion.* "Then the Fatherless was in anguish through thirst, and he cried, saying: 'Give me water to drink!' [John xix, 28.] So they gave him acid vinegar [Psa. lxix, 21; Matt. xxvii, 34; John xix, 29, 30]; and after he had drunk thereof, he cried: 'Of me did my father David prophesy, They gave me gall to eat, and in my thirst they gave me vinegar to drink.' But they answered: 'If thou wert God, why didst thou not know it was vinegar before tasting it? Now thou art at the brink of the grave, and chagest not!' But Jesus wept and said: '*My God, my God! why hast thou forsaken me!*' [Matt. xxvii, 46.] And the elders said: 'If thou be God, save thyself from our hands.' [Matt. xxvii, 39-43; Mark xv, 29-32; Luke xxiii, 36, 37.] But Jesus answered, saying: 'My blood is shed for the redemption of the world; for Isaiah prophesied of me: He was wounded for our transgressions, and bruised for our iniquities; our chastisement lies upon him that we may have peace, and by his wounds we are healed.' [Isa. liii, 5.]"
12. *Burial of Jesus.* "And when even was come, the wise men said: 'We may not, on account of the Fatherless, break the letter of the law which forbids that one who is hung, should remain all night on the tree. Though he may have set at naught the law, yet will not we.' [John xix, 31.] Now when even was come, Judas took down the body of Jeshu from the tree, and laid it in his garden in a conduit." "Therefore they buried the Fatherless in the place where he was stoned. [John xix, 41, 42.] And when midnight was come, the disciples came and seated themselves on the grave, and wept and lamented him. Now when Judas saw this, he took the body away, and buried it in his garden under a brook. He diverted the waters of the brook elsewhere; but when the body was laid in its bed, he brought its waters back again into its former channel."
13. *His Resurrection and Ascension.* "Now on the morrow, when the disciples had assembled and had seated themselves weeping, Judas came to them and said: 'Why weep ye? Seek ye him who was buried?' [John xx, 11-15.] And they dug and sought, and found him not; and all the company cried: 'He is not in the grave; he is risen and ascended into heaven; for when he was alive yet, he said he would raise him up. Selah!' And some of these went to Ai, and declared that on the third day after Jeshu had been hung, fire had fallen from heaven, which surrounded Jeshu, and he had risen alive, and gone up to heaven."
- "Now there was among them an elder whose name was Tanchuma. . . . And the Rabbi Tanchuma answered [Judas]: 'Jeshu the Fatherless is the occasion [of this new fast]; for he was hung up and buried on the spot where he was stoned; but now he is taken away, and we know not where he is gone. And

his worthless disciples cry out that he is ascended into heaven.” [Then Judas produced the body of the Fatherless from his own garden.] “Then the Rabbi Tanchuma hastened to the elders of Israel and told them all, and they came together and drew him [Jeshu] forth attached to the tail of a horse, and brought him before the queen and said: ‘See, this is the man who they say has ascended into heaven.’” [Simon Cephas is then represented as saying], “And this also doth he require of you, that ye do not celebrate the Feast of Unleavened Bread, but that ye keep holy the day on which he died. And in the place of the Feast of the Pentecost, that ye keep the fortieth day after his stoning, on which he went up into heaven.”

14. *Change of the Sabbath.* “Therefore they arose and desecrated the Sabbath.” “Therefore they abolished the law, and chose the first day of the week as the Sabbath, for that was the birthday of Jesus; and they ordained many other customs and bad feasts. Therefore have they no part and lot in Israel. They are accursed in this world, and accursed in the world to come. But the Lord bless his people Israel with peace. These are the words of Rabbi Jochanan, son of Saccai in Jerusalem.”

[The foregoing extracts taken from Baring-Gould’s *Lost and Hostile Gospels*, occur as follows: the *First Toledoth Jeshu*, on pages 76–101; the *Second Toledoth Jeshu*, on pages 102–115.]

EXHIBIT A.

THE CHRONOLOGY OF THE BOOKS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

In the first scheme following, the first four persons named are known as eminent Christian authors of the orthodox faith; those following are recognized critics of the negative school, rationalists of views more or less liberal respecting the Scriptures. Their several opinions as to the dates when the Historical Books of the New Testament were written are here indicated.

BOOK	SOHARFF	ALFORD	HARMAN	MITCHELL	KLEM	HOLTZMANN	SOHENKEL	WEISS	HILGENFELD	RÉAN	VOLKMAR	BAUR
Matt.	60-67	41-48	60-63	68-69	66	68	70	70	70	84	105-115	130
Mark	60-67	63	67-68	68-69	100	75	58	69	81	76	73	150
Luke	64-65	50-58	63	63-67	90	80	80	70-80	100	94	100-103	140
John	80-100	70-87	80	73-90	130	123	120	95	140	127	150	170
Acts	64	63		63-67						120		

a) THE HISTORICAL BOOKS.					
Book	Writer	Place	Addressed to	Date	Key Thought
1. <i>Synoptic Gospels:</i>					
First Gospel	Matt.	Judæa	Jewish Christians..	60-65	Jesus the true Messiah.
Second Gospel	Mark	Rome	Roman Christians	60-65	Jesus the Son of man.
Third Gospel	Luke	Cæsarea	Greek Christians ..	58-65	Jesus the Redeemer of men.
2. <i>Fourth Gospel</i>					
	John	Ephesus	Christian Church ..	90-95	Jesus Incarnate Son of God
3. <i>Acts of Apostles</i>					
	Luke	Rome	Gentile World.....	58-67	
β) THE PAULINE EPISTLES.					
Writings	Place	Addressed to	Date	Key Thought	
4. <i>Earliest Epistles:</i> <i>Two in number.</i>					
1. Thessalonians	Corinth	Thessalonian Christians..	52	{ Second Advent of Jesus Christ. Misapprehensions of advent corrected.	
2. Thessalonians	Corinth	Thessalonian Christians..	58		
5. <i>Epistles universally accredited:</i> <i>Four in number.</i>					
Galatians	Corinth or Ephesus	Church in Galatia.....	56	Salvation by faith.	
1. Corinthians ..	Macedonia	Church in Corinth.....	57	{ Resurrection of Jesus Christ. Defense of his own apostleship. Sin and the power of grace.	
2. Corinthians.....	Macedonia	Church in Corinth.....	57		
Romans.....	Corinth	Christians at Rome.....	58		
6. <i>Epistles of his Captivity: Three.</i>					
Philippians.....	Cæsarea or Rome	Church at Philippi.....	58-60	{ Spiritual encouragements. Unity of the Christians. Corrections of heretical views.	
Ephesians.....	Rome	Church at Ephesus.....	62-68		
Colossians.....	Rome	Church at Colosse	61-68		
7. <i>Pastoral Epistles:</i> <i>Three.</i>					
1. Timothy.....	Macedonia	His Convert Timothy.....	62-65	{ Church officers and their duties. Apprehension of his own death. Persons of Churchly offices.	
2. Timothy.....	Rome	His Convert Timothy.....	65-66		
Titus.....	Macedonia	Titus of Crete	65		
8. <i>One Personal Epistle:</i>					
Philemon	Rome	Master of Onesimus ... }	65	{ Slavery or freedom of Onesimus.	
9. <i>One General Epistle:</i>					
Hebrews.....	Palestine	Jewish Christians.. }	68, 64	{ High Priesthood of Jesus Christ.	

γ) THE CATHOLIC EPISTLES.				
Writings	Place	Addressed to	Date	Key Thought
1. James.....	Jerusalem...	Jewish Christians... }	63-64	{ Duties: prayer, faith, works. Encouragements in Christian life. The new heaven and new earth. Love of Jesus and the brethren. Loyal obedience to Jesus Christ. The general state of the Church.
2. 1 Peter.....	Babylon.....	The Dispersed Jews }	64	
3. 2 Peter.....	Unknown...	The Church in general... }	65	
4. 1 John.....	Judæa.....	The General Church..... }	90-95	
5. 2 John.....	Ephesus.....	To the Elect Lady..... }	90-95	
6. 3 John.....	Ephesus.....	Elder Beloved Gaius }	90-95	
δ) BOOK OF REVELATION.				
The Apocalypse.....	Patmos* or Ephesus...	Seven Churches of Asia..... }	96-98 or 68-69	{ *The consummation of all things.

* If the Apostle John was banished to Patmos under the reign of Nero, as the *internal evidence indicates*, he wrote the Apocalypse about A. D. 68 or 69; but the Gospel and Epistles were written at the later date given. This view is accepted by Neander, Lücke, Bleek, Ewald, DeWette, Baur, Hilgenfeld, Reuss, Düsterdieck, Weiss, Rénan, Stanley, Asbe, Stuart, Davidson, Cowles, Bishop Lightfoot, Westcott, and Schaff. But the older commentators and some recent ones, among whom are Elliott, Alford, Hengstenberg, Ebrard, Lange, Hofmann, Godet, Lee, etc., favor the traditional date as the *external evidence indicates*, which is A. D. 96, after Domitian's death. John is said to have died a natural death in the reign of Trajan about A. D. 98. (See on this Schaff, *Hist. Christ Church*, 1, 429, note 1; 834, note 2 and 3.)

EXHIBIT B.

TABLE OF HIGH PRIESTS AND ROMAN PROCURATORS.

A COMPLETE CHRONOLOGICAL LIST OF THE ROMAN PROCURATORS OF JUDÆA.				
No.	HIGH PRIESTS	Date	PROCURATORS OF JUDÆA	DATE
1	Annas or Ananus, son of Seth.....	A. D. 6	APPOINTED BY AUGUSTUS	A. D.
			Coponius.....	6-9
			Marcus Ambivius.....	9-12
			Annius Rufus.....	12-15
2	Ishmael, son of Fabus.....	15	APPOINTED BY TIBERIUS	
			Valerius Gratus.....	15-26
3	Eleazar, son of Annas.....	17	Pontius Pilate.....	26-36
4	Simon, son of Camithus.....	18	Marcellus * or Marcus.....	36, 37
5	Joseph Calaphas, son-in-law of Annas.....	34		
6	Jonathan, son of Annas.....	36		

No.	HIGH PRIESTS	Date	PROCURATORS OF JUDEÆA	DATE
7	Theophilus, son of Annas.....	37	APPOINTED BY CALIGULA Marullus † or Maryllius..... Publius Patronius..... Herod Agrippa I, king.....	37-39 39-41 41-44
8	Simon Canthera, son of Boethus..	41		
9	Matthias, son of Annas	42	APPOINTED BY CLAUDIUS Cuspius Fadus..... Tiberius Alexander..... Ventidius Cumanus..... Claudius Felix.....	44-46 46-48 48-52 52-60
10	Aljoneus, or Elionæus, son of Cantheras.....	43		
11	Joseph, son of Camydus.....	45		
12	Ananias, son of Nebæus.....	47		
13	Jonathan.....	47		
14	Ishmael, son of Fabi, junior.....	59		
15	Joseph Cabi, son of Simon.....	61	APPOINTED BY NERO Portius Festus..... Florus Albinus..... Gessius Florus..... Marcus Antonius } Julianus §	60-62 62-64 64-70 69, 70
16	Ananus, son of Annas	62		
17	Jesus, son of Damnæus.....	62		
18	Jesus, son of Gamaliel.....	63		
19	Matthias, son of Theophilus.....	65		
20	Phannias, son of Samuel.....	67		

* Appointed *pro tem.* upon the removal of Pontius Pilaté from the procuratorship in A. D. 36. Publius Patronius, President of Syria governed Judæa 39-41, when Herod Agrippa I had Judæa added to his kingdom from 41 to 44, when the king died, and Judæa lapsed into a province under a procurator.

† Marullus was titled "*Hipparch*," or "Master of the Horse;" 'Ἱππάρχων ἐπὶ τῆς Ἰουδαίας ἐκπέμπει Μάρυλλον. (Joseph. *Ant.* xviii, 6, 10.)

§ Julianus is inexactly called *ἐπιτροπος* for procurator by Josephus (*Wars*, vi, 4, 2); but probably never governed, but identified himself with the army of Titus, which completely obliterated the Jewish nationality in A. D. 70.

EXHIBIT C.

A COMPARATIVE VIEW OF THE OPINIONS OF PRE-EMINENT CRITICS
RESPECTING THE CHRONOLOGY OF THESE WITNESSES
AND DOCUMENTS.

FIRST CENTURY: A. D. 30-130.

WITNESSES AND DOCUMENTS.	SOHARR.....	ENCYCLOPEDIA BRITANNICA..	SMITH AND WADE	LARDNER ²	BISHOP LIGHT-FOOT.....	TISCHENDORF...	WESTCOTT	SALMON.....
Seneca		d. ¹ 65						
Paul.....	52-63 ²							
Mara	70							
Martial		97-98	100	100				
Juvenal.....		100		100				
Didaché.....	70-100							
Epictetus.....		40-110		109				
Tacitus	107	115-116	100	100				
Suetonius	120	98-138	b. ¹ 68	110				

¹ b.=born; d.=died.

² Date of writing.

WITNESSES AND DOCUMENTS.	SOHARF.....	ENCYCLOPEDIA BRITANNICA..	SMITH AND WADE.....	LARDNER.....	BISHOP LIGHT-FOOT.....	TISCHENDORF...	WESTFOOT.....	SALMON.....
Phny, Jr.....	109-111 ²	61-115	b. ¹ 61	106-107				
Trajan.....	98-117 ³			106-107				
Hadrian.....	117-138 ³			117		117		
Josephus.....	d. ¹ 103.	<i>Ant.</i> 93 <i>Wars</i> , 100	b. 37	<i>Wars</i> , 75 <i>Ant.</i> 93				
Talmud.....	150			180				
Toledoth Jeshu								
Clement (Rome)	95	98-101	68-81	96	95	70-80		96
Barnabas.....	97-100	119-126	70-79	70-79	70-79	117	100-105	70-79
Ignatius.....	107-108			70-107	100-110			
Polycarp.....	d. 155	d. 166	d. 155	108	d. 155			d. 155
Aristides.....	117-187		123-126	123				
Quadratus.....	117-187		125-127	123				
Diognetus.....	125-150				180-210			
SECOND CENTURY : A. D. 180-230.								
Aurelius.....	161-180	183-161	b. 121	176		161-180		
Celsus.....	161-180	154-166		176	165	150-160		
Lucian.....	b. 120 d. 200	150	176	176	165			
Galen.....		180-200		180				
Justin.....	147-150	148-165	187-161	140	140-160	138-139	145-146	150
Dion Cassius.....	155-229	155-229		230				
Hegesippus.....	d. 180		180	178			157-168	170
Muratorian Canon.....	170							
Melito.....	177	177	177	177	b. 120	177	170	170
Irenæus.....	177-190		b. 125	167	b. 120	177	180-220	180
Apollonius.....	b. 150							d. 185 ⁴
Clement (Alexandria).....	198-211	198-211	192	194			165-220	
Tertullian.....	200			200				197 ⁴
THIRD CENTURY : A. D. 230-330.								
Origen.....	245-248		246	230		225-254	160-240	
Porphyry.....	290-300	270	b. 233	270	304			
Lactantius.....	d. 330	302-329		306				
Hierocles.....		284-305	304	303				
Eusebius.....	315			315				
Constantine.....	312-337							
Julian.....	363	361-363 ³	361-363	361				

¹ b. = born, d. = died.² Date of writing.³ Emperor's reign.⁴ Opinion of Conybeare and Howson.

EXHIBIT D.

TABLE OF CONTEMPORANEOUS WITNESSES.

The design of this Exhibit is to represent the interlapping in the lives of contemporaries who witness to facts recorded in the New Testament, whether friends or foes. It serves to give in one view the unity and continuity of their collective testimony. Each line is based upon the supposed or known date of the author's birth. Also the evidential date and value of the documents related to different times and countries should be carefully noted.

- B. C. 8 Seneca, 65 A. D.
 A. D. 1 Apostle John, 95-100.
 A. D. 2 Apostle Paul, 66 or 67.
 A. D. 37 Josephus, 105.
 A. D. 40 Barnabas, 126.
 A. D. 40 Epictetus, 105.
 A. D. 43 Martial, 110.
 A. D. 45 Clement of Rome, 101.
 A. D. 50 Tacitus, 117.
 A. D. 52 Trajan, 117.
 A. D. 60 Juvenal, 105.
 A. D. 60 Ignatius, 107.
 A. D. 61 Pliny Junior, 118.
 A. D. 69 Polycarp, 155.
 A. D. 123 Celsus, 188. A. D. 70 Suetonius, 130.
 A. D. 125 Irenæus, 202. A. D. 76 Hadrian, 138.
 A. D. 130 Galen, 200. A. D. 83 Aristides, 144.
 A. D. 150 Apollonius, 240. A. D. 84 Quadratus, 148.
 A. D. 150 Tertullian, 240. A. D. 105 Justin, 165.
 A. D. 150 Clement of Alex'a., 220. A. D. 105 Hegesippus, 180.
 A. D. 155. Dion Cassius, 210. A. D. 120 Melito, 188.
 A. D. 185 Origen, 254. A. D. 120 Lucian, 190.
 A. D. 239 Porphyry, 310. A. D. 121 Aurelius, 180.
 A. D. 250 Lactantius, 327.
 A. D. 255 Hierocles, 310.
 A. D. 270 Eusebius, 340.
 Mara, dating A. D. 70. A. D. 272 Constantine, 337.
 Diadaché, A. D. 70-100. A. D. 331 Julian, 363.
 Logia of the Lord, A. D. 100-150.
 Epistle to Diognetus, A. D. 125-150.
 Muratorian Canon, A. D. 170.
 Jewish Talmud, A. D. 100-150.
 Toledoth Jeshu (Hist. of Jesus), date unknown.

EXHIBIT E—UNIVERSAL CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE.
THE FIRST CENTURY: 30-130 A. D.

EMPERORS	REIGN	CHARACTER NO.	WITNESSES	DATE	VOCATION	WORKS	NO.	WITNESSES	DATE	VOCATION	WORKS
1 AUGUSTUS	A. D.—14	Very Good									
2 TIBERIUS	14-37	{ Unrelent- ing *	Strabo	18	{ Historian and Geographer	Histories lost	1	Matthew	55-65	Disciple	Gospel
3 CALIGULA	37-41	Furious *					2	Mark	55-65	Evangelist	Gospel
4 CLAUDIUS	41-54	Feeble *	Seneca	64	Philosopher	Numerous	3	Luke	55-65	Evangelist	Gospel and Acts
5 NERO	54-68	Cruel *	{ Josephus	{ 75 103	{ Historian	{ Wars, An- tiquities	4	{ John Paul	{ 66-68 90-95	{ Disciple Epistles	{ Gospel, Epistles, Apocalypse
6 GALBA	68-70	Beastly *					5		52-65	Epistles	Epistles
7 OTHO											
8 VITELLIUS											
9 VESPASIAN	70-79	Fair					6	Barnabas	70-79	Unknown	Epistle
10 TITUS	79-81	Moderate					7	Clem't (Rome)	83-100	Bp. Rome	Epistle
11 DOMITIAN	81-96	Inhuman *									
12 NERVA	96-98	Mild	{ Tacitus	110	Historian	{ Rom. History { Rom. Annals	8				
			Martial	95	Epigrammatist		9				
			Juvenal	100	Satirist	Satires	10				
			{ Pliny, Jr.	{ 112 112	{ Proconsul Emperor	{ Letters Rescript	11				
13 TRAJAN	98-117		Trajan	109	Philosopher	Memiors	12				
			Epictetus	122	Historian	Cesars	13				
			Suetonius	117	Emperor	Rescript	14				
14 HADRIAN	117-138	Moderate	Hadrian				15				
							16				

THE SECOND CENTURY: 130-230 A. D.

15 ANTONINUS PIUS	139-161						12	Justin	145	Philosopher	Apologies
16 MARCUS AURELIUS	161-180		Marc. Aurelius	161	Emperor	Meditations	13	Hegesippus	170	Historian	Memorials
			{ Lucian	{ 160 150	{ Philosopher Physician	{ Protius A True Word	14	Melfio	177	Bp. of Sardis	Apology
			{ Galen	{ 180		{ Diff. Puls	15	Irenaeus	177	Bp. of Lyons	Adv. Heresies
17 COMMODUS	180-192						16	Apollonius	185	Apologist	Apology
18 PERTINAX	192										
19 JULIAN	193										
20 SEPTIMIUS SEVERUS	193-211						17	Clement (Alex)	164	Philosopher	Miscellany
21 CARACALLA	211-217						18	Tertullian	200	Juriconsult	Apology
22 MACRINUS	217-218										
23 HELIOGABALUS	218-222										
24 ALEXAND. SEVERUS	222-235		Dion Cassius	230	Historian	Rom. History					

THE THIRD CENTURY: 230-330

EMPERORS	REIGN OR CHARACTER NO.	WITNESSES	DATE	VOCATION	WORKS	NO.	WITNESSES	DATE	VOCATION	WORKS
25 MAXIMIN										
26 THE GORDIANS										
27 MAXIMUS	235-238									
28 BALBINUS	238-244									
29 GORDIANUS	244-249									
30 PHILIP	249-251									
31 DECIUS	251-253									
32 GALLUS	253-260									
33 VALERIAN	260-268									
34 GALLENUS	268-270									
35 CLAUDIUS	270-275									
36 AURELIAN	275-276		270	Author	{ Philos. of Oracles	19	Origen	245	Philosopher	Contra Celsum
37 TAOTUS	276									
38 FLORIANUS	276-282									
39 PROBUS	282-283									
40 CARUS	283-285									
41 NUMERIANUS	284-285									
42 CARINUS	284-285									
43 DIOCLETIAN	284-308		308	Author	{ To the Christians	20	Lactantius	306	Historian	Ecccl. History
44 MAXIMIAN	286-308									
45 GALERIUS	292-311									
46 CONSTANTIUS	292-306									
47 SEVERUS	304-307									
48 MAXIMIN	304-313									
49 MAXENTIUS	306-312									
50 CONSTANTINE	306-337									
51 LICINIUS	307-324									
52 CONSTANTINE II	337-340									
53 CONSTANS	337-350									
54 CONSTANTIUS	337-361									
55 JULIAN	361-363	APOSTATE	361	Author	Seven books	19	Julian			

* These epithets are applied by Edward Gibbon to these emperors severally, and he adds: "They are condemned to everlasting infamy." (Gibbon's *Rome*, Vol. I, p. 96, Harpers' ed.)

No.	Document	Date	Language
1	Mara	A. D.	Syriac
2	Didaché	70-100	Greek
3	The Logia	100-150?	Greek
4	A Gospel	100?	Syriac
5	Diognetus	150	Greek
6	The Talmud	150	Hebrew
7	Toledoth Jeshu	Unknown	Rabbinical
8	{ Muratorian { Canon	170	Greek

INDEX.

A.

	PAGE.
Abbot, Dr. Ezra, on the Golden Age of mankind,	23
Consensus of the books of the N. T.,	627
Abrabanel, Rabbi, on the Star of the Messiah,	74, 75
Accompaniments of Christ's Nativity,	63-89
Adams, Dr. Nehemiah, on Zoroaster, and the Magi of the East,	72
Administrations, remarkable changes in,	385-411
Adversaries of Christianity classified,	12
Advocates of Christianity classified,	13
Agabus predicts a great famine,	420, 421
Age, The Golden, of the world,	24-26, 32
Agrippa I, Herod, king of Judæa,	481-489
His parentage, birth and death,	481
His surname, title and religion,	481, 482
His early relations with Caligula,	482
Is imprisoned by Emperor Tiberius,	482
Caligula's grandmother intercedes,	582
Tiberius dies and Caligula succeeds,	482
Agrippa is exalted to royalty,	482, 483
Departs to his kingdom of Judæa,	483
His royalty mocked in Alexandria, Egypt,	483
Soon returns to Rome on religious mission,	483
Caligula, insane, claims Divine honors,	483, 484
Agrippa dissuades him from erecting his statue in the Jewish Temple,	483-485
Caligula dies and Claudius succeeds,	485
His accession largely due to Agrippa,	485
Claudius confirms and enlarges Agrippa's kingdom,	485
Agrippa distressed about his eligibility to be ruler of the Jews,	485, 486
Is humiliated by his superior, Vibius, president of Syria,	486
A coin of Agrippa's sovereignty,	486, 500
Agrippa beheads the Apostle James,	487
Visits Cæsarea to honor the Emperor,	487
Appears in theater in amazing splendor,	487
Is there smitten with death,	487, 488
Accounts thereof by Luke and Josephus compared,	488, 489
Agrippa II, Herod, son of Agrippa I,	489-493
Distinguished from his father, in the New Testament,	489, 490

	PAGE.
His youth and education at Rome,	490
Is early appointed King of Chalcis,	490, 491
Soon transferred to a greater kingdom,	491
Is appointed superintendent of Jews' Temple, manager of their treasury, with power to remove high priests,	491
Claudius dies, and Nero succeeds, who adds cities and villages to Agrippa's realm,	491
Agrippa issues coin in Nero's honor,	491, 500
Visits Cæsarea, and hears Paul's defense of his faith,	492, 493
In the war, joins Roman forces against his own Jewish subjects,	493
Alexander the Great, brought Greek letters into Palestine, . . .	24
On meeting Jews, is amazed beholding on the High Priest's miter the name Jehovah,	571, 573
Offers sacrifices in the Jews' Temple,	572
Alexaménos, a caricature of the crucified Christ,	374, 375
Alford, Dr. Henry, an epitome of,	389
On disposition of criminals' garments,	399
His reason for calling a tetrarch a "king,"	* 479
His explanation of the term <i>Νεωκρότος</i> ,	* 462
Andrew's discovery of the Messiah,	49
Anonymous writer's conception of miracle,	119, 164
Anticipations of Messiah,	21-39
Chaldaic Targum, The, on his Advent,	28, 29
Jewish Talmud, The, on Messiah's birth,	26-28
Anticipates his Incarnation,	27-31
Jewish People's expectations,	29-31
Other nations looked for a Messiah,	31-33
Messiah of Canaanites and Samaritans,	32
Christ's own claim to Messiahship discussed,	35-39
Antioch, in Syria, where Christ's followers were first called Christians,	316
Antipas, Herod, the Tetrarch,	477-481
His character as a man and ruler,	99, 100
How settled over his Tetrarchy,	99, 100
Intrigue and marriage with Herodias,	100, 480
His imprisonment of John the Baptist,	100
Machærus, the name and place of John's prison,	102, 103
There Antipas executes the Baptist,	103, 104
Discussion of the Tetrarch's motives and vacillation,	103-105
Exposure of his disloyalty to Caligula,	477
Antipas is deposed, confiscated, and banished by the Emperor, .	477, 478
His tetrarchy transferred to Agrippa I,	477, 478
Antipas's relations with Jesus,	477, 481
Why a mere Tetrarch is called King in the New Testament, 279, 280, and note.	

	PAGE.
Antiquities, as witnesses of sacred history,	12
Apologists of Christianity explained,	12
Apollonius, The Apologist, an epitome of,	346, 347
On the life of primitive Christians,	356, 357
The just an offense to the unjust,	368
Apostles of Jesus, and their Work,	315-342
On the historical existence of the Apostles of Jesus Christ,	318
The four lists recorded in the New Testament,	322
First called Christians at Antioch,	316, * 349
Talmud on the Apostles' names,	319
Toledoth Jeshu on the number, mission, and success of the Apostles,	319
Celsus on their number, and character,	319
Julian on the success of the Apostles' mission,	319
Testimony of Barnabas, Aristides, Tertullian, and Paul on Christian success,	319, 320
Analysis of the foregoing testimony,	320, 321
James, the Lord's brother, becomes also an Apostle,	321, 322
When he became converted to the faith,	322
Pre-eminence of James among the Jews,	323, 324
Pre-eminence of James among Christians,	322-324
Review and inductions,	326, 327
Christ's Apostles wrought many Miracles,	328-333
Miracles in demand by their work,	328, 329
Their miracles were all wrought in Christ's name,	329
How adversaries explained miracles,	330-332
Origen's witness on the continuance of miracles in his time,	332
Review of testimony on the Apostles' miracles,	332, 333
Apostles' Mission and Ministry to the Nations,	333-342
The testimony of disbelievers on the success of Christianity,	333, 334
Confirmed by Christian writers,	334-336
Christianity and the Roman Empire,	336-342
Edicts of Constantine the Great,	336, 337
The apostolic success as recorded in the New Testament,	337-341
State Church as organized under Constantine,	336, 337
Obstacles which opposed the Christian religion,	340, 341
The final triumph of Christianity,	337-339
Apostles' Creed, summarizes the facts of the Faith,	310
Teaching of the Twelve Apostles (Didaché),	674, 675
Apostolic Fathers, the appellation explained,	12, 214, 278
Appeals to the reigning Cæsar: Agrippa appeals against Antipas,	477, 478
Philo and company appeal to Rome,	452
Suetonius on appeals to the Emperor,	576
Pliny on Christian appeals,	576, 671
Paul appeals from Festus to Cæsar,	447, 448
Appendix of this work,	663-694

	PAGE.
Appian, on Roman citizenship,	444
Archæology (see Bennett's Christian Art), on Christian Baptism, 109, 110	
Archelaus, Herod, the Ethnarch,	472-475
Is denied royalty by Augustus,	472
Made Ethnarch over half of Judæa,	472
Usurps kingly authority at once,	472, 473
Is extremely cruel towards his subjects,	473
Is finally deposed, confiscated, and banished,	473
Gospel's brief notice of Archelaus,	474
Criticism on the Gospel's exactness,	474, 475, 479, 480
Aretas, King of Arabia. On his Kingship over Damascus,	455, 559
Testimony of Josephus, Conybeare and Howson,	560
Coins of Aretas in existence,	560, 561
Weiseler's explanation of the coins,	561
Eckhel's explanation of the situation,	560, 561
Aristides, Marcianus, an epitome of,	116, 216
On Christ as the source of Christian Religion,	124, 230
On the identity of the spoken and written Gospel,	304
Jesus pierced, died and was buried,	304
After three days he rose and ascended,	304
The Apostles then went forth preaching,	304
The Apostolic Creed partly cited,	305
The practical life of early Christians,	355, 356
Arnold, Matthew, an epitome of,	237
On the resurrection of Jesus Christ,	239
Arnold, Thomas, an epitome of,	347
His criticism of Gibbon on the Christian persecutions,	377
Arrian, on feigned Roman citizenship,	445
Ascension of Jesus Christ,	295, 297-311
The sayings of Christ respecting it,	299, 300
The realization attested by evangelists,	300, 301
The witness of Peter and Stephen,	301, 302
The witness of John and Paul,	306
Testimony of Jewish adversaries,	302, 303
Testimony of Roman adversaries,	303
Testimony of Apostolic Fathers,	303, 304
Testimony of Christian Apologists,	304, 305
Analysis of testimonies, and inductions legitimated,	310, 311
Astronomical argument on the Star of the Nativity,	74, 75
Athanasius, on the Founder of Christianity,	316
Athens, Paul waiting at,	567
Athenians extremely religious,	567, 568
The numerous statues of their gods,	568
Introduction of strange gods was death,	* 568
On the altar of the Unknown God,	567, 569-573
Augustus, First Emperor of Rome,	413, 415-419

	PAGE.
His title and life,	418
How the appellation Augustus descended to subsequent emperors,	418, note, * 424
In authority and power supreme,	416-418
Is angry toward Herod the Great,	466
His sarcasm on Herod's murderous conduct,	69, 467
Augustan band explained,	573, note 79, 574
Aurelius, Marcus Antonius, Emperor, an epitome of,	118
His dislike of Christians and Christianity,	350, 351

B.

Bacon, Lord, on the Bible,	503
Balaam, on the advent of the coming Messiah,	66
Baptism, the element and mode,	109, 110, 127, 128
Baptist, John, his unique place in history,	91-111
The sanctity of his life and work,	95
Testimony of Evangelists and Josephus,	96, 97
Chronology of John's ministry,	97
Strauss confirms Luke's accuracy,	98
Luke confirmed by Tacitus and Josephus,	99, 100
Evangelists on John's offense,	100
Josephus's confirmation of the Gospels,	100, 101
Occasion for the Baptist's execution,	101
Machærus the place of John's prison and death,	102, 103
Antipas's motive for beheading John,	103
His vacillation of purpose explained,	104, 105
Skeptical objection to the narrative of the execution,	105
John's peculiar relation to Jesus,	106, 107
John's unique mission with his people,	108
Confirmations by Christian writers,	108, 109
Re-corroboration by Christian Art,	109, 110
Review and summary,	110, 111
Bardesanes, on the Lord's day,	132
Barker, Joseph, on the horror of infidelity,	635
Bar-Kokheba, the false Messiah,	73
Issued a coin bearing a Star,	73
Barnabas, epitome of,	214-216
Antiquity of his epistle,	215, 216
His testimony on the number and authority of the Apostles,	623
On the miracles wrought by Christ,	623
On six details of Christ's sufferings,	623, 624
Barnabas testifies to Christ's crucifixion,	624
To his resurrection,	624
To the institution of the Sabbath,	624
To the Lord's ascension,	624
To Matthew's Gospel as then "written,"	624

	PAGE.
Battle-ground, ancient, of Christianity,	591
Baur, Ferdinand Christian, epitome of,	236
On the historicity of Christ's resurrection,	279, 292
On the disciples' faith in the resurrection,	283
Beale, Professor, on Protoplasm and Bathybius,	198
Bernice, a Herodian Princess,	493, 495, 496
Bevan, on Roman citizenship,	445
Beyschlag, Christian Church the offspring of a miracle, not of a lie, On Christ's resurrection,	292 238
Bichart, X, on the constant changeableness of natural forces, . .	190
Birth-place of the Messiah designated,	26, 27, 57, 58
Biscoe, errors of classic writers on apostolic times,	456
Talmud's explanation of Paul's scourging,	447
Blackstone, William, on the law of Nature, and the law of Reve- lation,	503 398, 399
Body-guard of executed criminals,	398, 399
Bolingbroke, an epitome of,	213
On Isaiah's prediction of Christ's death,	217
Books of the New Testament,	637-639
On the art of ancient book-making,	637, 638
The materials used in the art,	637, 638
The methods of ancient writers,	638, 639
(On the manuscripts of the Sacred Books, see Manuscripts of the New Testament); Witness of Roman adversaries to the existence, authors, contents and antiquity of the Books of the New Testament,	598-626 596-599 597 600, 601, 605 602, 603, 606 606-611 620, 621 622 615 617, 618 622, 623 616 617 618-620 619, 620 623-626 615, 626, 627, 639 614, 615
Emperor Julian's witness to Sacred Books, and their contents, 596-599	
On their apostolic authorship,	
Hierocles attests five sacred books,	
Porphyry's witness to several authors,	
Celsus constantly attributes the historical books to Christ's disciples,	
Justin confirms, calling them "Memoirs,"	
Papias on Matthew, Mark, John and Peter,	
Origen on the Gospels, the Johannine and Petrine Epistles, Hebrews, and Revelation,	
Tertullian on six Pauline Epistles,	
Clement of Rome cites fourteen books,	
Muratorian Canon, on the origin of John's Gospel,	
Confirmation by Clement of Alexandria,	
Irenæus, on the Gospels,	
On the authority of Matthew's " <i>written</i> " Gospel,	
Barnabas on Matthew, the contents, quotations, and declara- tion of a " <i>written</i> " Gospel,	
On the Titles of the Sacred Books,	
On the Signatures of the Sacred Writers,	

	PAGE.
Lord Hales's citations of the New Testament taken from the early Fathers,	629, 630
Citations from all the Books of the New Testament by two apostolic Fathers, and two Christian Apologists, for two centuries after their publication,	627-632
Lardner, Rawlinson, and Given, on citations from New Testament, compared with those from classic writings, as evidence of historicity,	627-631
How Sacred Books were properly preserved,	* 618
How transmitted, identified, and accepted as apostolic, . . .	620
How the Sacred Books were first burned by the Roman government,	600, 656
Canon of the Sacred Books, how formed,	649-661
(See Council of Trent),	657, 658
Brewer, Justice David J., on the satisfactions and comforts of the Bible,	635
Bruce, on Christian miracles,	185
Bunsen, on the date of Barnabas's Epistle,	215
Burial of criminals' dead bodies,	399

C.

Caligula and Herod Agrippa I,	482-485
Were educated together at Rome,	481, 482
Became mutually and warmly attached,	482
Caligula becomes Emperor,	482
His character as Emperor,	419, 420
He demanded divine honors to himself,	419, 483, 484
As characterized by Edward Gibbon,	365
Caludius, on the Star of the Messiah,	72
Canaanite cognizes the Messiah in Christ,	32
Canon of the Books of the New Testament,	649-660
The term Canon explained,	649
The Canon and the Church Councils,	650
History of the Sacred Canon of the New Testament,	652-660
Discussion by Salmon and Westcott,	653, 654
William Hone, on the Canon of the New Testament,	651, 652
Caricature of the Crucified Christ,	374, 375
Tertullian on a Roman caricature,	375
Carpenter, Dr. W. B., epitome of,	183, 184
On the source of all power in mind,	200
Science, man's conception of the order of the universe, . .	188, 191
Rejects Huxley's doctrine of Bathybius,	198
Cassidorus, on Quirinius's enrollments,	82
Cassius, Dion, epitome of,	94
Great famine in Italy,	523, 524
On the execution of Lollia Paulina,	105

	PAGE.
A slave bearing a tablet with a written accusation thereon,	398
Jews' superstition for the walls of the Temple,	535, 536
Catalogues, eleven, of the Books of the New Testament,	656, 657
Carlyle on Atheism and the Creator,	197
Cæsars, The, five in number,	413, 415-425
Cæsarea Philippi, the capital of Herod Agrippa II,	491
Celsus, epitome of,	388
On the Messiah, foretold and honored,	35
The Nativity of Jesus,	54, 56, 58, 59, 61, 69
On the Magi (Wise Men) of the East,	73
Slaying of children of Bethlehem,	69
On the flight of Jesus to Egypt,	68, 69
Concedes the fact of Christ's baptism,	107
On the ministry of our Lord,	121-123
He ascribes miracles to Jesus Christ,	151
Incidents of Christ's passion,	219
His agony in Gethsemane,	219, 220
His betrayal by Judas Iscariot,	220, 319
The mock-royalty to taunt Jesus,	220
Scourging inflicted on Christ's person,	220, 224
Incidents connected with Christ's death,	222
The crucifixion of Jesus Christ,	224
His reception of proffered vinegar,	223
The Jews punished for offering him gall,	223
On the outcry of Jesus to the Father,	225
The veritable death of Jesus,	224, 267
On the blood which followed the spear,	225
Earthquake and preternatural darkness,	225
On the descent of Christ into Hades,	226
The Son of God sent to save the Jews,	125, 126, 220
Christ the object of supreme worship,	125, 224, 373, 374
The resurrection of Jesus Christ,	267
Christ suffered in behalf of mankind,	125, 220
On Jesus as the God-hating sorcerer,	151, 152
Savior the Son of the greatest God,	125
On the disciples of Christ,	319
The inspiration of the Apostles,	221
Sacred books ascribed to Christ's disciples,	606-611
On Celsus's knowledge of the New Testament,	388, 389
He persecutes the Christians,	361
His mistakes about the Magi and the Herods,	* 69, 392
Census or registration,	403
Centurion,	403, note 46
Christ (see Jesus Christ.)	
Christ, the Historical,	113, 115-125
His unique ministry inaugurated,	120-124

	PAGE.
His activities as Leader, Teacher, and Preacher,	121-123
Christ the Founder of Christianity,	123-125, 224, 228, 229
Christianity, The Ancient,	125
Its ancient doctrines,	125
As attested by adversaries,	125-127
The Institutions of,	125-127
Baptism, as teaching of the Apostles,	127, 128
The Lord's Supper or the Eucharist,	128, 129
The Lord's-day,	130-134
Council of Nicæa on the Lord's-day,	130
Constantine and other Christian authorities,	130-134
Christianity of Christ,	134-137
The atonement made by Christ,	125, 126
The resurrection of the human body,	126
The immortality of the human spirit,	126
The general judgment of mankind,	126
The final punishment of the incorrigible,	126, 127
Christian Era, the, and Dionysius Exiguus,	76, 77, 593, 594
Christians escape at the siege of Jerusalem,	*528-530
Christian persecutions,	343, 345-383
Christlieb, Theodore, epitome of,	164
On the miraculous foundation of Gospel history,	170
Christ himself the central miracle of history,	172
Place of miracles in the Christian system,	169-210
On the origin of living organisms,	200
Reply to Strauss on explaining a miracle,	204, 205
Criticism of Rénan's treatment of miracles,	209, 210
His reply to Rénan on submitting a present miracle to the <i>savants</i> of Paris,	207
Chronology of the Books of the New Testament,	687-790
Chronological table of Contemporary Witnesses,	693, 694
Chronology of John the Baptist's ministry,	97
Chronology of the Apostle John's exile to, and release from Patmos,	133, note 65
Chrysostom, John, epitome of,	163
On the evangelists' want of signatures to their Gospels,	614
Chubb, Thomas, his view of miracles,	186
Circumstances concurrent with the Nativity of Jesus,	63, 65-89
Joseph, and family, and Egypt,	67, 68
Children of Bethlehem slain,	68
The fact conceded by Celsus,	69
Testimony of the Toledoth Jeshu,	69
Sarcastic jest by Augustus on Herod,	69
Maccabean treaty violated by Herod,	70
The Wise men of the East and the Star,	71
Nestorian claim about Zoroaster and the Star of Bethlehem, . . .	72

	PAGE.
Testimony of Caludius, a philosopher,	72
The Jewish Talmud and the Star,	72, 73
The Christ-impostor, Bar-Kokheba, and his star,	73
Origen and Celsus on the Star,	73, 74
Patristic testimony on the Star,	73, 74
Testimony of Rabbi Abrabanel on the Star,	74
Kepler, Schubert, Pritchard, Ideler, Pingré, and Encke, on this astronomical phenomenon,	75
Edersheim, Wieseler, and Schaff, on the Star of Bethlehem,	75
The death of king Herod the Great,	76
The enrollments under Quirinius,	77, 78
The Roman enrollment, but Jewish method,	78, 79
The researches of Augustus W. Zumpt,	79, 80
Cassidorus, Suidas, and others on the enrollment of the Nativity,	82
Confirmation by Josephus, Julian, Justin, Tertullian, and Clement of Alexandria,	84, 85
Reconfirmed by a monumental slab bearing an inscription,	86, 87
Summary of this evidence,	87-89
Cicero, on Roman citizenship,	442-443
Citizenship, Roman,	441
How acquired and restricted,	444, 445
The rights conferred by law,	441-443
Sometimes conferred by sheer caprice,	443
The Jews eligible conditionally,	444, 445
How deprived and annulled,	443, 444
Citizens exempt from torture by law,	442, 446
Feigned citizenship severely punished,	445
Citizenship of Paul,	446-449
Why did he not claim his rights from scourging,	446-448
How the order was given to scourge,	446
Claudius, the Emperor, epitome of,	413, 420
His character as an Emperor,	365, 417, 420
He banished Christian Jews from Rome,	363, 422, 423
Clay, Henry, his regard for Christianity,	635
Clement of Alexandria (born about 160, died about 215), on the first enrollment at the Nativity,	85
On Peter preaching publicly at Rome,	619
Mark's Gospel composed from Peter's preaching,	619, 620
On the origin of John's Gospel,	616, 617
On John the Baptist,	108
Clement of Rome, epitome of,	116, 235
On the resurrection of Jesus Christ,	269
Coins of the Herods,	500, 501
Coin of Aretas,	580, 561
Coleridge on miracles and Revelation,	164

	PAGE.
On vipers on the island Malta,	578
Comparative table of witnesses,	690
Compté, on the subjection of the intellect of man to a law of necessity,	192
Huxley's repudiation of the doctrine,	192
Conspectus of this work,	9
Constantine, the Great, epitome of,	118, 8
His imperial edicts favorable to Christianity,	336, 337
His inauguration of the State Church,	336
Converts to Christianity called Christians,	316, 317
Conybeare and Howson, on Tarsus as a free city,	444
The Aretas dynasty and Damascus,	560
On the Politarchs of Asia,	565, 566
The identity of the island Melita (Malta),	577, 578
Coponius, procurator of Judæa, replaces Archelaus the Ethnarch, Is invested with the power of life and death,	473 473
Council of Nicæa,	130
Council of Trent,	657, 658
Critics, on the chronology of witnesses and documents,	690, 691
Criteria of Testimonies,	15
Custody proper for the Sacred Documents,	16, *618
Cyprian, Bishop, on the Lord's-day,	131, 279

D.

Damascus, and Paul's escape from Aretas,	559
Dana, Professor James D., on Science and the Book of God,	503
Dates comparative of critics' opinions,	690, 691
Davies, G. S., on the numerous statues to the gods at Athens,	568, 569
Didaché, or teaching of the Apostles,	119
On Christian Baptism,	127, 128
Diocletian, Emperor, on persecutions of the Christians,	366, 367, 372
Burial of dead bodies of criminals,	398, 399
Diognetus, on the Epistle to,	346
On Christian persecutions,	367
Dion Cassius see Cassius).	
Dionysius Exiguus (see Exiguus),	76, 77, 594
Divergent testimonies, Canon of,	15
Domitian, the Emperor, arrogates to himself the title Lord,	452
Drusilla, a Herodian princess, wife of Felix,	496, 497, 500
Dryden, lines on Christian persecutions,	382
DuBoise, Raymond, on bridging the living, and not-living,	199

E.

Ebrard, on how seeming discrepancies arise,	* 258
Eckhel, on exchange of Damascus and Petra,	560
Eclipse of the moon at Herod's death,	76

	PAGE.
Edersheim, epitome of,	66
On the Advent of the Messiah,	67
Christ's life began and ended with a miracle,	237
On the Nativity and the Chinese astronomical tables,	75
On the method of Jewish enrollments,	79
Ἑλλην and Ἑλληνιστής in distinction in the New Testament,	* 508
Emperors, Roman,	413, 413-425
Their function and power,	417, and ‡
Some assumed the title of the Deity,	419, 420
Several characterized by Gibbon,	365
Encke, on the Star of the Nativity,	75, 88
Enrollments made by Quirinius,	77-89, 400
Luke's statement thereon,	77
Two different enrollments effected,	80
Both are mentioned by the Evangelist,	81
Cassiodorus and Suidas on enrollments,	82
Silence of Josephus, as evidence,	82, 83
Testimony of Julian (Emperor),	84
Testimony of Justin, Clement of Alexandria, and Tertullian,	85
Monumental evidence of,	86, 87
Epictetus, epitome of,	347
His opinion of the Christians,	349
Ephesus, city in Asia Minor,	561, 562
Visited by Paul,	561
Era, Christian, reckoned by Dionysius Exiguus,	76, 77, 594
Escape of the Christians from the siege of Jerusalem,	528-530
Josephus on this escape,	528, 529, 530
Dr. Philip Schaff on this event,	528, 529
Eusebius on its occurrence,	529
Epiphanius, makes mention of it,	529, 530
Eusebius, the first Christian historian, epitome of,	93
On the Holy Quaternion of the Gospels,	95
On John the Baptist,	95-111
On James the Just, the Lord's brother,	315
On the Lord's day,	131
Time in Christ's life covered by John's Gospel,	96, 97
The Lord's brother first Bishop of Jerusalem,	324
After Paul's appeal, Jews turned upon James the Just in persecution,	324, 325
Pilate reported Christ's resurrection to the Emperor Tiberius, Tiberius proposed to the Senate Christ to be a deity of the empire,	* 426 522
Great famine prevailed over the world,	523
Apostles' exodus from the siege, Jerusalem,	528, 529
Christ predicts Jerusalem's destruction,	519
Evidences, documentary and monumental,	4, 5

	PAGE.
Historical evidences, characteristics of,	13, 14
Evidential value of the Gospels,	409-411
Criteria of testimonies,	15
Value of added witnesses,	14, 15
Custody of ancient documents,	16
Mere opinions not historical evidence,	53
Ewald, epitome of,	236
On the Apostles and Christ's resurrection,	237, 283, 291
Exchange of territory between Emperor and Senate,	416, 417, 455, 560
Excursus, A-G,	663, 665-694
A. Josephus's testimony of Jesus,	665-671
B. Pliny's State paper to Trajan,	671, 672
C. Logia of our Lord (Christ's sayings),	673, 674
D. Didaché, or teaching of the Apostles,	674, 675
E. The Muratorian Canon,	675, 676
F. Expurgated Talmud of the Jews,	676-678
G. Toledoth Jeshu (History of Jesus),	678-687
Exhibits, A-E,	663, 687-694
A. Chronology of Books of the New Testament,	687-689
B. High Priests and Procurators,	689, 690
C. Critics' Chronology of Witnesses and Ancient Documents,	690, 691
D. Contemporary Witnesses,	692
E. Universal Chronological table,	693, 694
Exiguus, Dionysius, on the Christian Era,	76, 77, 594
F.	
Family of David, Messianic fulfillment,	25, 26
Famine, great, predicted by Agabus,	420-422
Farrar, on the passion of Jesus Christ,	217
Machærus, the Baptist's prison,	103
On scourging of Paul, a Roman citizen,	447
The character of procurator Felix,	497
The kingship of the Tetrarch Antipas,	*479
The coin of the line of Aretas,	561
Felix, procurator of Judæa,	436, 437
His character by Tacitus,	*437, 438, 497, 498
As given according to Josephus,	438, 439
According to Thomas Lewin,	438
According to Farrar,	497
Evidence of procuratorship from coins,	438
His marriage with Drusilla,	496, 497
Paul's address to Felix justified,	438, 439
Felix arrested and sent to Rome,	450
Festus, succeeds Felix as procurator of Judæa,	450
Josephus on the succession,	450
The character of Festus,	449, 450

	PAGE.
His use of the title "my Lord,"	450, 451
Fisher, Professor George P., epitome of,	143, 144
On the advancement and power of the Christian Religion, . .	557
Christ and the destruction of Jerusalem,	545, 546
First day of the week (see Lord's-day),	130
Fortitude of the Christians persecuted,	558, 559
Franklin, Benjamin, on Paine's <i>Age of Reason</i> ,	635
Frey, Rabbi, traditional Address of Magi to Herod,	71
Disposition of Christ's body after death,	227
Fronto on the expression "My Lord,"	452
G.	
Galen, epitome of,	348
His opinion of Christian firmness,	351
Gallio, proconsul of Achaïa,	452
Refuses charge against Paul,	452, 454, 457
Garments of executed criminals,	399
Genealogy of the Herodian family,	500
Geography, Historical, of the New Testament,	557, 558, 559
Paul at Damascus,	559
Paul at Ephesus,	561
Paul at Philippi,	562
Paul at Thessalonica,	565
Paul at Athens,	567
Paul at Melita (Malta),	576-580
Paul at Puteoli (Puzzuoli),	580, 581
Paul at Rome,	581-584
Gibbon, Edward, the historian, epitome of,	213, 214
On preternatural darkness at Christ's death,	226
Confirms Tacitus and Suetonius on the persecutions of the Christians,	229, 362, 363
Justifies early Christians against their persecutors, . . .	370, 376, 377
Criticised by Thomas Arnold, and by Lecky as destitute of all sympathy for the persecuted,	377, 378
On the inalienable rights of conscience,	353
Christians rejected the gods of Rome,	348
Holy places polluted by monuments of idolatry,	540
Gibbon's characterization of some early Emperors,	365
Given, Professor J. J., comparison of sacred and classic books for authenticity, and citations,	629, 631
Lord Hales on citations of early Fathers from the New Testament,	629, 630
Golden Age,	23-26, 32
Gospels, the special objects of Evangelists, in writing them, . . .	50-52
Government, remarkable changes in the first fifty years of our era,	406-408

	PAGE.
Goethe, epitome of,	587, 588
His emphasis upon the Gospels of Christ,	589
Grætz, Heinrich, a Jewish historian,	225
His testimony on Christ's miracles,	151
Apostles went forth executing miracles,	332
Jews tempt Judas to betray Jesus,	225
On the exact time of the Crucifixion,	225
The inscription on the cross,	225
Christ's outcry to the Father,	225
On the place of Christ's burial,	225
The terrible results following to the Jews,	225
Confesses the founding of Christianity,	225
Gratianus, Serenius, his protest against Christian persecution, .	366
Rescript of Hadrian on persecution,	366
Grant, U. S., on the Bible,	635
Greek and Grecians distinguished in the New Testament,	* 508
Greenleaf on the custody of ancient documents,	16, * 618
Griesbach, on prolusion,	257, 258
Grove, W. R., on causation and creation,	200
Guizot, Professor, on the Bible and its triumphs,	557

H.

Häckel, Professor, on the origin of life,	199
On the existence of Moneron,	198
Haddarshan, Rabbi Moses, on the Resurrection of the Messiah, .	269
Hadrian, Emperor, his rescript on the persecutions,	366
Hakkodesh, Rabbi Judah, on the Resurrection of the Messiah, .	269
Hales, Lord, on citations from the New Testament, on early Fathers,	629, 630
Hamann, John G., epitome of,	163
A miracle required to believe a miracle,	164
Hausrath, characterization of Herod Antipas,	477
Hegesippus, the historian, on the Lord's brother, James the Just, 323-325	
Herod the Great, king,	462-472
Born of Idumæan stock,	463
How he became procurator,	463, 464
How he acquired royalty,	464
His character as a ruler,	462-464, 76
His conduct in his own family,	466, 467
His disposition toward Christ,	467, 468
His treachery to the royalty of the Maccabees,	70
Herodian rulers of the second generation,	472-481
Herod Archelaus (see Archelaus),	472-477
Herod Philip II (Herod Philip),	475-477
Herod Antipas (see Antipas),	477-481
Herodias, a princess of the house,	494, 495

	PAGE.
Eloped and married Antipas,	100, 480, 494, 495
Her dealings with John the Baptist,	480, 495
Herschel, on all discoveries confirming Scriptures,	503
Hesychius, Bishop of Egypt, on accusations written on tablets,	398
Hierocles, epitome of,	141
On Christ as a magician,	144
Concedes that he wrought miracles,	144, 601
Affirms that Christ ascended to heaven,	303
Christians called Jesus God,	374
His persecution of the Christians,	655
Attests Peter and Paul as Apostles,	601
Histories, Sacred and Secular, compared,	628, 629, 632
Hodge, Dr. Charles, on miracles,	145
Huldreich, his edition of the Toledoth Jeshu,	678-687
On Jesus learning magic in Egypt,	680, 681
A marriage of Mary and Joseph Pandira,	679
On the beheading of the Baptist,	682
Hume, David, epitome of,	142
On not having read the New Testament,	635
His position about miracles of Scripture,	146, 186
Hume's position refuted by Huxley,	146, 147
Miracles contrary to experience,	202
His prediction that Christianity will fade away in 1900,	557
Huxley, Thomas H., epitome of,	142, 143
Refutes Hume on miracles,	146, 147
On the absurdity of atheism,	185
Is refuted on Bathybius, and spontaneous generation,	197-199
On evolution and the living and not-living,	199-200

I.

Ideler, astronomer, on the Star of the Nativity,	75
Ignatius, epitome of,	46, 47
On the tribe and incarnation of Jesus,	58
Christ's passion, death and resurrection,	230, 270
On the Lord's-day as the Sabbath,	132, 278
On the Eucharist, or Lord's Supper,	128
Incarnation of Jesus Christ,	60-62
Institutions of Christianity,	127-134
On the institution of Baptism,	127, 128
On the Lord's Supper,	128
On the Lord's-day,	130-134
Constantine's edict on the Lord's-day,	131
Eusebius verifies the same,	131
Confirmations by Peter and Cyprian,	131
Testimonies by Irenæus, Bardesenes, Justin, Ignatius, on the Lord's-day,	131, 132

	PAGE.
Testimony of John, Barnabas, the Didaché, and Paul, on the Lord's-day,	133
Introduction of this book,	ix-xvii
Plan of the work,	ix
The proposition,	ix
Function of witnesses,	ix-xii
Adverse witnesses classified,	xii
Advocates classified,	xiii
Characteristics of Historical Evidence,	xiii, xiv
Value of added witnesses,	xiv, xv
Criteria of testimonies,	xv, xvi
Canon of divergent testimony,	xv
Starkie on conflicting testimony,	xv
Lewis on original witnesses,	xv
Greenleaf on custody of documents,	xvi
Prospectus of the work,	xvi, xvii
Irenæus, epitome of,	66
On the Lord's Supper (Eucharist),	128
On the Lord's-day (Sabbath),	132, 278
On Christ's ascension,	304
Written Gospels the source of Christianity,	618-620
Adoration and gifts of the Magi,	73
On the Star of Bethlehem,	73
On Christ's resurrection,	278
Christian miracles wrought in Christ's name,	158, 159
J.	
James, the Just (the Lord's brother),	315, 321-327, 254, 255
Josephus's reference to James,	666, 667
Discriminated from others of that name,	321
His place in Joseph's family,	322
His pre-eminence among the Jews,	323
Not mentioned in the four lists of the Apostles,	322
How afterward he became an Apostle,	254, 255, 322
Became pre-eminent among Christians,	322, 323, 255
How he became first Bishop of the Church,	255, 324
How he was martyred by the Jews,	324-327
Jefferson, Thomas, on Christ's system of morality,	348
Jerome, epitome of,	217
On an eclipse of the sun at Christ's crucifixion,	230, 231
Jerusalem, destruction of,	519-554
Jesus Christ, anticipated as the Messiah of prophecy,	21, 23-39
On the Nativity of Christ,	41-62
On concurrent circumstances,	63-89
The Christ of History,	113, 115-125
His unique ministry,	120-123

	PAGE.
Was the Founder of Christianity,	123-125, 134-137
Proof of miracles which Christ wrought,	139, 141-160
A definition of a miracle,	145, 146, 189
Christ's miracles witnessed by his disciples,	147
Never denied for centuries,	148
Attested by Jewish authorities,	149-151
Conceded by Roman philosophers,	151-155
Heathen explanations of Christ's miracles,	156
Testimony of Christian writers,	158, 159
Miracles true and false,	152-154
The Christianity of Christ,	134-137
(For Christ's passion, death, and burial, see	213-232
For the resurrection of Jesus from the dead, see	233-293
For Christ's ascension to heaven, see	295-311
For characteristics and value of his miracles, see	161, 163-179
For modern objections to miracles, see	181, 188-210.)
Jewish Literature of the Messiah,	26-31
The Talmud on Messiah's birth,	28, 27
On the incarnation of Messiah,	27, 28
Chaldaic Targums on Messiah,	28, 29
Jewish people and their Messiah,	29-31
Persecutions of the Christians,	343, 359-361
Implacable hate for Christ's people,	360
Prayers for curses on the Gentiles,	360, 361
Jewish Nation, in times of the New Testament,	501, 503-554
Jews' condition in the period of Christ,	504
Sanhedrin, how organized,	505, 506
Its functions and place of sitting,	506
Rise of sectional differences and services,	507-509
"The Dispersed" put to disadvantage,	509-512
On different sects among the Jews,	512, 513
Spirit of insubordination and conspiracy,	515-518
Destruction of the Jewish nationality,	518-554
Christ's predictions and their fulfillment,	518-546
The beginning of sorrows,	523
The signs of warning,	526
To be accomplished in that generation,	530
Cessation of sacrifices forever,	534, 535
The Temple at Jerusalem burned to ashes,	535
The predicted conquest completed,	538, 543
The captives and their treatment,	541, 542
Why visited on that generation,	543, 544
Christ and this terrible situation,	545, 546
The Roman conquest and triumph,	546, 547
The Arch of Vespasian and Titus at Rome,	547, 548

	PAGE.
The prediction, realization, and advantages to the Christian world,	549-554
John, the Lord's Apostle,	52, 133, 616-619
His release from Patmos,	133 note
How John's Gospel originated,	616, 617, 619
Confirmed by Clement of Alexandria,	617
Its authorship identified by Irenæus,	616
Attested by other Apostles, present,	616
Special object in writing his Gospel,	52, 617
John's witness to Christ's resurrection and ascension,	306
His testimony on the Lord's own day,	133
Irenæus on the death of John,	619
John, the Baptist (see under Baptist, John),	91, 93-111
Joseph's family and Egypt,	67, 68
Josephus, epitome of,	387, 388
On the expected Messiah,	34, 38, 39
His testimony of Jesus Christ,	613, 665-671
On the success of his ministry,	318, 665
On James, the brother of Jesus,	315, 324, 325
Character of John the Baptist,	97
His imprisonment and death,	100-103
Occasion of John's execution,	101
Confirms Luke on Theudas and Judas,	83, 84
On Herod's sons and their territories,	99, 100, 406-408
Marriage of Antipas and Herodias,	100
Aretas's quarrel with Antipas,	100
Florus on scourging and crucifying Jews,	396, 397
The great famine in Judæa,	420-422
Coponius appointed procurator,	473
Jews lived under their own laws,	395
Idumæans and the unburied dead,	399
Caligula claims to be a deity,	419, 451
Orders his statue in Jews' Temple,	419, 420
Is dissuaded by Agrippa I,	420, 483, 484
Claudius controlled by his freedmen,	420
Gratus and Pilate made procurators,	428, 429
Pilate transfers his army to Jerusalem,	429
Pilate's cruelty and vacillation,	432, 433
The traveling tribunal of Philip II,	430
Pilate appropriates the sacred Corban,	434
He orders the slaughter of the Jews,	434
He also massacres many of the Samaritans,	434
Felix appointed as procurator,	438
Felix and an Egyptian impostor,	439, 440
Festus succeeds Felix as procurator,	450

	PAGE.
Herod's father once procurator,	463, 464
The Herods were of Idumæan stock,	463
The time of Herod's procuratorship,	463
Governed conjointly with his brother,	464
Herod usurped the power of death,	506
Parthians invade Herod's territory,	464
Herod flees to Rome for help,	464
Cæsar crowns Herod king of Palestine,	464
He restores the Temple at Jerusalem,	465
Rebuilds the Temple of the Samaritans,	466
Builds a monument over royal tombs,	466
Herod the Great married nine wives,	467
He executes his favorite wife, Mariamne,	467
And her grandfather Hyrcanus,	467
He also slays three of his own sons,	467
Proposes to massacre his own nobles,	467
Augustus is angry with Herod the Great,	466
Had allowed him to appoint his sons his successors,	470
Simon usurped his kingship at Herod's death,	471, 475
Josephus designates Antipas a tetrarch,	470, 476
How Herod Archelaus became ethnarch,	471
The localities in Philip's tetrarchy,	471
The localities in Antipas's tetrarchy,	471
Archelaus mentioned as eldest brother,	472
Augustus denied him a kingdom,	472, 475
But he usurped kingly prerogatives,	472
Archelaus slew thousands of subjects,	473
Soon he was deposed and banished,	473
His ethnarchy became a Roman province,	473
Coponius was made procurator over Judæa,	394, 473
Power over life and death given Coponius,	473
Quirinius registers the Jews' property,	473
Quadratus sends Ananus to Rome in chains,	576
Julius made Antipater a citizen of Rome,	445
Jews refuse to call any man Lord,	451
Jews discourage learning foreign languages,	509
The dispersion of Jews in all lands,	511
Antipas builds the city of Tiberias,	474
The parentage of Herod Philip II,	475
Salome was his wife and niece,	475
Philip builds Cæsarea-Philippi for his capital,	476
The death and burial of Philip II,	476
Antipas, the youngest of three brothers,	477
Is appointed tetrarch over Galilee and Peræa,	477
The character of Herod Antipas,	477
Proves disloyal to Emperor Caligula,	477

	PAGE.
Is deposed and perpetually exiled,	477, 478
Had eloped and married his brother's wife,	480
Antipas's behavior with Jesus,	480, 481
Parentage and marriage of Agrippa I,	481
He is styled Agrippa the Great,	481, 482
He was a zealous Jew educated at Rome,	482
In youth was intimate with Caligula,	482
Was magnetic and fond of popularity,	482
He reflected on Tiberius and was put in irons,	482, 582
Tiberius dies and Caligula succeeds him,	482
Caligula appoints Agrippa to royalty,	482
Substitutes a gold chain for the iron one,	483
Claudius succeeds Caligula, as emperor,	485
Makes Agrippa's kingdom identical with that of Herod the Great, his grandfather,	485
Agrippa I is twice humiliated by Vibius, president of Syria,	486
King Agrippa celebrates games at Cæsarea,	487
Is arrayed in gorgeous apparel in the theater,	487
People shout that Agrippa is a god,	488
Nor does he rebuke the impious flattery,	488
Agrippa I dies after five days,	489
His son was now but a youth at Rome,	490
Claudius makes him king of Chalcis,	491
Fadus made procurator over the kingdom of Agrippa I, . . .	490
Soon Agrippa II is removed to a greater kingdom,	491
He has authority over the Temple, its treasury, and the High Priests,	491
He enlarges Cæsarea-Philippi in honor of Nero,	491
Is regarded as cold-blooded and arbitrary,	491
Makes several visits of courtesy,	492, 493, 496
Respecting Bernice, this Agrippa's sister,	495, 496
Respecting Drusilla, sister of Agrippa II,	496, 497
Origin of the sect called Sadducees,	512
On the sect of Jews called Pharisees,	513
On enmity between Jews and Samaritans,	514
Samaritans excluded from the Temple,	515
The two impostors, Theudas and Judas,	516
A conspiracy to kill Herod the Great,	517
Josephus arraigns some Jews as criminals,	518
Procurators deal with impostors and robbers,	520, 521
On earthquakes and pestilence,	524
Greeks and Syrians slay many Jews,	525
Many instances of thousands of Jews slain,	525, 526
Cumanus deposed and banished,	525
Roman soldier insults Jews at Passover,	526
Pilate and Roman eagles in Jerusalem,	527

	PAGE.
Herod's golden eagle and the Temple,	527
Vitellius marched around the Jews' land,	527
Cestius withdraws army from his siege of Jerusalem,	528
Many inhabitants now escape the siege,	529, 530
Titus raises banks against Jerusalem,	532
The Roman army constructs walls,	532
The calamities of famine and deaths,	532, 533
Dead bodies thrown down before the walls,	533
Date when the Jewish-Roman war began,	534
When sacrificing at the Temple ceased forever,	534
Titus resolves to storm the Temple,	535
Battering-rams fail at certain points,	535
The Temple burned to its foundation,	535
Massive walls were leveled,	538, 539
The city reduced to shapeless ruins,	538, 540
Romans bring in "the abomination of desolation,"	537
They sacrificed to their gods in the Temple courts,	537
Titus attributes the conquest to God,	537, 538
The former city contrasted with its ruins,	536, 540
Captives, their wives and children sold to be slaves,	542
Estimates of numbers lost in this war,	541-543
Vitellius held a grudge against Antipas,	559
Damascenes and the bribery of Agrippa I,	560
Moses offering prayers in open air,	563
Alexander meeting the High Priest,	571, 572
Syrian's appreciation of Cæsarean soldiers,	574
Varus sends a captain to the Emperor,	576
Felix sent noted robbers to Cæsar,	576
Vitellius sent Pilate also to Rome,	576
Josephus ship-wrecked, reached Puteoli,	581
Both Antipas and Fortunatu sailed to Puteoli,	581
Julian, Emperor, epitome of,	43, 44
Affirms Jesus was a subject of Cæsar,	54
That he was enrolled by Quirinius,	54
That Christ's relatives did not believe on Jesus,	54
That Christ had been celebrated 300 years,	54
That Christians claimed Jesus was begotten by the Holy Ghost,	54
That the genealogy derives him from Judah,	54
That Matthew and Luke differ in genealogy,	54
That Christians believed Jesus born of a Virgin,	55
They continually call Mary, mother of God,	55
On the birth and incarnation of Jesus,	596, 597
On the books of the New Testament,	597-599
On the miracles of Jesus Christ,	155, 599, 600
Names the authors of the four Gospels,	597

	PAGE.
Mentions also Peter and Paul,	597
Also citations from Matthew and Luke,	598
Cites from Pauline Epistles,	598, 599
His disparagement of early Christians,	596
His opinion of the Christian religion,	351, 354
His ridicule of Christian Baptism,	127
He persecutes Christians for their religion,	354, 357
On the Apostles' success in preaching,	319
Admits the conversion of Cornelius, and of Sergius Paulus, .	319
Julius, the Centurion, Paul placed in his charge to sail,	573
The cohort of soldiers under him,	573, 574
Justin Martyr, the Apologist, an epitome of,	65, 66
On the Magi, or Wise Men of the East,	74
The enrollment of Quirinius,	85
Prophecy of John until Jesus came,	108
The Christians were called Atheists,	353
The place of Jesus in the Trinity,	353
The practice of the Lord's Supper,	128
The practice on the Lord's-day,	132
The resurrection and ascension of Christ,	305
The Jews' persecution of Christians,	367
Pilate's official report of Christ's resurrection, to the Emperor,	* 426
His reproof of Jews for sending abroad false reports about Christ and Christianity,	* 243
On Jews cursing the Christians in their synagogues,	367
Juvenal, the Roman poet, an epitome of,	345
On punishments inflicted on criminals,	376
The Jews' place of worship at Rome,	563

K.

Kant, creation inexplicable by matter alone,	200
Keim, Dr. Theodore, epitome of,	236, 237
On the resurrection of Christ,	271, 272
Denial, not due to scientific or religious conscience,	328, 329
Keim's criticism of the vision theory of Christ's resurrection,	290, 291
The exalted and reticent originality of Christ's sayings, . . .	589
Paul on the resurrection,	271, 272, 290, 291
Kepler, his astronomical argument on the Star of the Nativity, .	75
Köslin, on a faith without signs and wonders,	178

L.

Lactantius, epitome of,	216, 217
On absurdity of forcing conscience,	348
Lange, on Herod and the Messianic Prophet,	70
Lardner, Dr. Nathaniel, an eminent critic, epitome of,	49, 5
On the authenticity of the New Testament Scriptures,	628

	PAGE.
Lecky, on Christ as an ideal character,	120
Critics' unexamining incredulity,	185
Christ, the enduring principle of regeneration,	124
Gibbon's want of sympathy with martyrs,	377, 378
Legate, Quirinius, his functions of office,	425
Lewin, Thomas, on the coins of Aretas,	560
The Jews proseuchæ,	564
Magistrates on monuments, not in books,	566
Death for disturbing religion of the State,	568 *
Felix and Festus procurators of Judæa,	438
The Neokóros of Thessalonica, the authoritative Speaker of Senate and Assembly,	562
Paul at the Philippian proseucha,	564
On Alexander, and the Book of Daniel,	572
Intimacy of Jews and Greeks,	572, 573
On the Primate of the Maltese,	578
On viper, and bundles of wood at Malta,	579
Lewis, Sir George C., on credibility of original witnesses,	15, 461
Liebig, the eminent scientist, epitome of,	183
Denies life existing from eternity,	200
Life, its origin unaccountable says Hæckel,	199
DuBoise, on the living, and the not-living,	199
Huxley, on evolution and origin of life,	199
Thomson that life proceeds from life,	200
Kant, matter alone can not explain life,	200
Tyndall, life only from antecedent life,	200
Liebig, once organic life did not exist,	200
Schenkel, harmony not annihilated by a creative God,	200
Grove, creation is the act of God,	200
Christlieb, life on earth has not always existed,	200
Cuvier, it is easy to indicate when life on earth began,	200
Lightfoot, on the Rabbis, and the Greek language,	509
Lincoln, Abraham, the Bible the best gift of God to man,	635
Livy, epitome of,	389
On scourging and crucifixion,	396
Locke, John, on the miracles of Jesus Christ,	164
Logia, or the sayings of Jesus Christ,	673, 674
Longfellow, lines on the word of the Lord,	635
Lord's-day, by whom instituted,	130-134, 278, 279
Lucan, on the Unknown God,	570, 571
Lucian, epitome of,	115, 604, 605
On Christ's introduction of Christianity,	123
Christians' worship of Christ,	605
Their disregard for temporal things,	605
Their belief in their own immortality,	361, 605
Their tender offices for each other,	355, 605

	PAGE.
Lucian's disrespectful reference to Paul,	605
On freedom given to the city Tarsus,	444
Summary of Lucian's testimony,	606
Luke's special object in writing a Gospel,	51
Christ's followers first called Christians,	315
Luther, Martin, on the Council of Trent,	658
Lyell, Sir Charles, epitome of,	183
On atavism among descendants,	190, 191
Lyndhurst, Lord, on the resurrection of Christ,	239

M.

Machærus, prison of John the Baptist,	102, 103
Maclear, on indirect historical allusions in the New Testament,	389
Changes in government first fifty years,	461
Archæological discoveries and sacred history,	415
Macrobius, Augustus's sarcasm on Herod the Great,	69
Magi, or Wise Men, and the Star of the Nativity,	71, 72
Malta (island Melita), and the ship-wreck of the Apostle Paul,	576-580
Manuscripts of the New Testament,	636-646
On many books in one,	636
The ancient art of book-making,	637
The ancient penmen employed,	638
The materials used for writing,	637, 638
The Uncial manuscripts, characteristics,	639
The Cursive manuscripts, characteristics,	640
Origin and distribution of Uncials,	638, 639
Number and distribution of Cursives,	640, 641
Supplementary manuscripts,	642
Palimpsest manuscripts,	640
Alexandrian manuscript,	641, 642
Sinaitic manuscript,	643, 644
Vatican manuscript,	642, 643
Occasion of errors in transcriptions,	645
Detection of impostures,	646
Mara, an Arabic writer, on Christianity based on miracles and parables,	159
The Jews and the crucified Christ,	224, 225
Purity in life of early Christians,	355
Mark's Gospel, its origin and characteristics,	52
Martensen, on the ascension of Christ,	298
Martial, epitome of,	345
Describes the sufferings of Christ,	376
Matthew's Gospel, special object and peculiarities of,	50, 51
Maxwell, Chief Justice, on reading the Bible,	635
Melito, epitome of,	297
Incarnation, death, resurrection, and ascension of Christ,	305

	PAGE.
Memorabilia, Christ's prediction of the destruction of the Jewish nation,	545, 546
Messiah of Scripture,	31-39
Anticipations of,	19, 21-39
Realization of,	41, 43-62
Accompaniments of his advent,	63, 65-89
Mill, John Stuart, epitome of,	119
On historicity of Christ,	120
Proof of miracles legitimate,	145
Explains the phrase, "Laws of Nature,"	188
Which can not account for their own origin,	199
Miracles of the New Testament,	139, 141-210, 328-333
Definition of the word "miracle,"	145, 189, 171, 172
Anonymous author's idea of miracle,	164
Miracles as explained by heathen writers,	156, 330-332, 599, 603, 604
Miracles distinguished from Magical Arts,	166-169, 179
On miracles true or fictitious,	152-154
Reality of Christ's miracles,	141-160
Wrought in the disciples' presence,	147
Adversaries witness to his miracles,	154, 155
Christian writers also attest,	158
Apostles wrought miracles in Christ's name,	328-333
They were manifold in number,	330
Miracles wrought in later centuries,	332
All miracles Christo-centric,	171-174
Were evidential in character and design,	178
Were epochal in history,	174-177
Negation of miracles historically,	186
Miracles not denied for centuries,	148
Modern objections to miracles,	183-210
Hume, on miracles as violation of natural laws, 146, 186, 202, 203, 188	
Huxley's refutation of Hume,	146, 147
Nature, and our knowledge of her laws,	190
Nature's forces modifiable by man,	193
Natural forces antagonistic,	194, 195
Miracles a higher order of nature,	201
Hume on miracles contrary to experience,	202, 203
Miracles and Deism, Materialism, and Pantheism,	201
Miracles as having never been investigated,	204-207
Characteristics and value of miracles,	163-179
Evidence of miracles reviewed,	332, 333
Missionary journeys of Paul,	555-584
Mistakes of Roman writers on apostolic times, . . . * 69, 391-393, 406, * 498	
Monumental evidences of the New Testament: Schaff on the value	
of monumental evidence,	3, 4
Palestine itself a perpetual monument of history,	411

	PAGE.
An inscription on Nero's freeing Portugal of robbers and Christians,	364
On Quirinius's enumeration of citizens at Venice,	86
Another of Quirinius as legate and proconsul, at Tibur, Tivoli,	86, 87
Still another of Quirinius at Rome, mentioned by Tacitus,	87
A monument at Ancyra, recording three enrollments,	87
An inscription in Judæa, mentioned by Tertullian,	87
An inscription of seven Politarchs, in Thessalonica,	565, 566
Two inscriptions in Malta, dedicated to the "Primate of the Maltese,"	578
Arch and inscription to Vespasian, and Titus at Rome,	547, 548
Ancient coins with inscriptions: Coin of Herod the Great, king,	500, 501
Coin of Archelaus, ethnarch,	66, 471, 472
Coins of Philip II, tetrarch,	66, 471, 472, 476, 500, 501
Coin of Herod Antipas, tetrarch,	500, 501
Coin of Agrippa I, king,	486, 500, 501
Coin of Agrippa, II, king,	491, 500, 501
Coin of Felix, procurator of Judæa,	438
Coin of Cominius Proculus, proconsul of Cyprus,	454
Coin of Sergius Paulus, proconsul of Cyprus,	454
Coin of Diana of the Ephesians,	562
Coin of Aretas of Damascus,	561
Coin of Judæa conquered,	547
Monuments in other different forms: The existing Church of Christ,	273-275
The ordinance of Christian Baptism,	109, 110, 127, 128
The ordinance of the Lord's Supper,	128-130
The institution of the Lord's-day,	130-134, 275-279
A Graffito in caricature of Christ crucified,	374-376
Word-tests of the New Testament,	402-405
Moses, prediction of happiness or punishments of the future Israel,	542, 543
Mozley, creation and science not contradictory,	197
Michælis, on origin of errors in sacred books,	645
McClintock and Strong's Cyclopedia on Christian persecutions,	378
On coins of Aretas,	560
Milman, on the accuracy of Christ's prediction of the Jews' sufferings,	519
Romans polluting the sacred places,	540
Empire armed to defend polytheism,	348
Splendor of the Roman triumph,	546
Müller, on formation of living organisms out of lifeless matter,	200
Muratorian Canon, a description of,	616, 675

N.

	PAGE.
Nativity of Jesus Christ,	43-89
Nero, his infamies of life, and suicidal death,	417, 423
Nestorians, on Zoroaster and the Magi,	72
<i>Νεωκώροϋς</i> , explained,	561, *562
New Testament historicity verified,	585, 587-632
Newton, Sir Isaac, on the Bible, its sure authenticity,	503
Nitzsch, Karl Immanuel, epitome of,	143
To deny miracles as impossible, is to deny the freedom of God,	144
Norton, Professor Andrews, epitome of,	588
Exactness of Justin on Christ's life,	621
Christendom and the Canon of the New Testament,	625

O.

Onkelos's Targum, on the anticipated Messiah,	29
Oosterzee, J. J., van, epitome of,	184
On denying the impossibility of miracles,	184
On Christ's ascension to heaven,	298
The caprice of transferring from the history of Jesus to the	
Apostles,	238
No one has the right to deny the possibility of miracles,	197
Opinions, mere, not evidential,	37
Those held respecting miracles,	148
Those held for early Christians and Christianity,	349-351
Origen, epitome of,	45, 46
On the Nativity of Christ,	73
On the virginity of Mary, his mother,	271
On the resurrection of Jesus,	271
John's baptism and the Holy Ghost,	109
On Celsus saying Jesus was Leader of his people,	122
That miracles were wrought in the middle of the third	
century,	158, 332
On Celsus writing, "A true Discourse,"	388
Christ's prediction and armies at Jerusalem,	325, 326
On the success of the Gospel to his time,	335, 336
Transmission of the four Gospels,	614
John's three, and Peter's two Epistles,	614, 615
On the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews,	615

P.

Palestine, changes of government first fifty years,	385-394
Two civilizations in one community,	394-405
Two systems of law for one people,	395-402
Changes in political geography,	405-408
Value of these facts in the Gospels,	409-411
Paley, on his Evidences of Christianity,	3

	PAGE.
Papias, epitome of,	587
Testimony on the four Gospels,	622
Paul, the Apostle, the great change wrought in his life,	271, 306
On the Nativity of Jesus Christ,	58
Testimony on his death and resurrection,	271-273
On Christ's ascension to heaven,	306
On the first day of the week as the Lord's-day,	133
Paul as a Roman citizen, thrice claimed,	441, 446
Why he did not claim it when scourged,	446, 447
His appeal to Cæsar at Rome,	448, 449
His journeys to the Gentile world,	555, 557-584
The Apostle Paul at Damascus,	559-561
Paul at Ephesus,	561, 562
Paul at Philippi,	562-565
Paul at Thessalonica,	565-567
Paul at Athens,	567-573
Paul at Cæsarea,	573, 574
Paul at Melita (Malta),	576-581
Paul at Puteoli (Pozzuoli),	580, 581
Paul at Rome,	581-584
Paulus, Heinrich, E. G., epitome of,	347
On Christ's resurrection,	281
Pausanias, on the images of Hermes extending from Athens to Peræus,	568
Persecutions of the primitive Christians,	345-383
Opprobrious opinions entertained by Epictetus, Tacitus, Pliny, Suetonius, Aurelius, Galen, Porphyry, and Julian,	349-353
Occasion of this heathen prejudice,	353, 354, 361, 372-374
That Christians were pure and blameless in character,	354-357
On persistent persecutions by the heathen,	358, 359
And malignant persecutions by the Jews,	359, 361
Cruelty imposed by the Sanhedrin,	359, 360
Christians cursed in Jewish prayers to God,	360
Ostracized in service and intercourse,	360, 361
Denounced in Talmudic literature,	360
Persecuted by the Romans,	361-383
Occasion of Roman persecutions,	372-374, 379-383
Literary persecutions by philosophers, Celsus, Lucian, Porphyry, and Hierocles,	361, 373, 374
Imperial persecutions by Claudius,	422, 423, 363, note 52
By Nero,	361-365, 368, 423, 362, note, 52
By Trajan, (with Pliny),	365, 366, 369, 371
By Hadrian,	366
By Diocletian, and Maximian,	366, 367, 370, 372
By Julian,	374, 351
Gibbon severely denounces the last five Cæsars,	365

	PAGE.
Confirmations by Apologists, Justin Martyr, Diognetus, Apollonius, and Tertullian,	367, 368
Review of the evidence adduced,	368-370
The four periods of Christian persecution,	370-373
Caricature of the crucified Christ worshiped,	374, 375
General survey of the situation,	379-382
Inductions from foregoing facts,	383
Peter's sermons reported as Mark's Gospel,	52
Peter, Bishop of Alexandria, testimony on the Lord's-day, . . .	131
Philo, and company call Caligula, "My Lord,"	452, 570
On the Jews' praying place,	563
Pilate, made procurator of Judæa,	428, 429
His character as a Roman ruler of Jews,	432-436
His violence and vacillation to his subjects,	432
Why he was at Jerusalem on Jewish feast-day,	429, 430
How Pilate's wife was at Jerusalem when Jesus was put on trial,	431, 432
Her message to Pilate about Christ,	431, 432
His tessellated pavement for purposes of judicature,	430
His enmity and amity over Christ,	433-436
Pilate reports his resurrection to the Emperor Tiberius, . 230, * 426	
Pilate is arrested and sent to Rome,	576
Pingré, on the Star of the Nativity,	75, 76, 88
Plato, on the just and righteous man,	218
Pliny, epitome of,	117
His State paper to Emperor Trajan,	671, 672
On the Lord's Supper,	128
Obligations assumed by early Christians,	356
Christians' fidelity to Christ, brought death,	365, 366
On Christians as Roman citizens,	576
Plutarch, epitome of,	389
On punishments,	397
Politarchs in Asia, the title of office explained,	565-567
A monument of, in Thessalonica,	566
Polycarp, epitome of,	235, 236
On the resurrection of Christ,	270
On Christ's ascension to heaven,	304
Pompey, his conquest of the Jews' Palestine,	391, 462, 535
Pool, of British Museum, on magicians and miracles,	167
Porphyry, epitome of,	117
His question on universal salvation,	126
He concedes miracles as facts,	154
He affirms Christ's ascension,	303
His opinion of Christians,	351
On persecution of Christians,	374
Pritchard, on the Star of the Magi,	75

	PAGE
Proconsuls, three instances mentioned in the New Testament, . . .	452-458
Proconsul, a term of office, explained,	456
Exchange of territory between the Emperor and Roman	
Senate,	453-455
Paul and proconsul Sergius of Cyprus,	453
Paul and proconsul Gallio of Achaïa,	454
A coin attests Luke's exactness,	454
Summary and inductions,	457, 458
Procurator's office explained,	426
(For list of procurators, see Exhibit B),	689, 690
Proseucha, a place of prayer,	563-565
Punishment of criminals,	396-398
Roman orders to scourge,	446
Other modes of inflicting punishments,	376
Voice of modern historians on,	376-378
A survey of punishment inflicted on Christians,	379
Antagonism of the natural man,	380
Christians exulted in sufferings,	382
Dryden's lines in conclusion,	382
Inductions,	383

Q.

Quadratus, a Christian Apologist, epitome of,	141, 142
Attests the miracles of Christ,	159
Quadratus, Roman president of Syria, sent Samaritans and Jews	
to Cæsar,	576
Sent Ananus, the high priest to Rome in chains,	576
Quirinius, a Roman Legate of Syria,	425
Charged with financial affairs in Judæa,	473
Enrolled the population at the time of the Nativity,	77, 80
Registered the Jews' property about six years afterward, . .	79-89, 425

R.

Rabbis, Jewish, on Christ's ascension,	303
Ramsay, on Quirinius's enrollments,	78, 79
Rawlinson, Professor George, epitome of,	589
On present knowledge of first century,	3
Agreement of sacred and secular history,	415
Credibility of contemporary witnesses,	461
Roman citizenship, how acquired,	445
On historical geography of the New Testament,	558, 559
On the titles of the books of the New Testament,	628
Registration (see enrollments),	77-89, 400
Rénan, epitome of,	184
On Christian miracles,	187, 205-210
His eulogy on the crucified Christ,	124

	PAGE.
On the ascension of Christ,	298
The Apostles' preaching and persecutions,	348
Retrocession in the chronology of critics,	592, 593
Revelation progressive in character,	25, 26
Richter, Jean Paul, epitome of,	164
On the life of Christ and history,	136
Roman rulers of the Jews,	413, 415-458
Rothe, R., epitome of,	163, 164
On miracles as a mode of revelation,	164
No stumbling-block in conceiving miracles,	184
Rousseau, epitome of,	142
On the death of Socrates and Christ,	119
The absurdity of questioning miracles,	144
The majesty of the New Testament Scriptures,	589
Applies Plato's Just Man to Jesus Christ,	218, 219

S.

Sabbath, the Christian (see Lord's-day),	130-134, 275-279
Salmon, Dr. George, Professor, epitome of,	652
On formation of the New Testament Canon,	652, 653
Transfers of territory between Emperor and Senate,	455
Sanhedrin, Jewish, on how it originated,	505, 506
Its functions and place for sessions,	506
Its persecutions of Gentiles and Christians,	360, 361
Schaff, Dr. Philip, epitome of,	143
On recent discoveries and investigations,	4, 5
Gospels unparalleled by secular history,	17
Witness of Persian Magi, and Savior,	71
On homage paid to Mary by the Magi,	73†
Astronomical argument on the Star of the Nativity,	75
On Celsus as against deists, Strauss and Rénan,	3, 388
The Lord's Supper as a sacrament and a sacrifice,	129
Christ's contemporaries' belief in his miracles,	144, 149
On the impossibility of miracles,	194, 197
On shifting the resurrection from fact to fiction,	287
On Keim's confession of ignorance, or return to Apostles' faith in the resurrection,	289
On James the Just, the Lord's brother,	324
On the Diocletian persecution,	367, 655, 656
Romans exacting worship of their gods,	373
Tortured Christians, of both sexes, of all ages,	378
On Christians' escape from siege of Jerusalem,	528, 529
Work of Titus, and survival of Jewish race,	548, 549
The awful destruction of Jewish nationality and of the the- ocracy,	553

PAGE.

Main facts and doctrines of Christianity, in the first four	
Pauline Epistles,	* 592
Josephus's testimony of Jesus Christ in every manuscript and	
version of his Antiquities,	668
Schenkel, Daniel, epitome of,	143
More intelligence required to believe than to reject miracles,	144
No conflict with nature on the appearance of a creating God,	200
On a belief in the resurrection of Christ,	291, 292
Those disbelieving in God, believe in ghosts,	169
Scholias, The, on Nero's persecution,	362, note
Scrivener, on the Vulgate version,	647
Seneca, the philosopher and statesman, epitome of,	436
The teacher of Emperor Nero,	423
On Roman punishments of criminals,	376
An awful pestilence destroys population,	524
Sergius Paulus, proconsul of Cyprus,	453
His own coin of office as proconsul,	454
His successor's coin of office also,	454
Conversion of Sergius mentioned by Emperor Julian,	319
Shakespeare, William, on the comfort of believing in God, . . .	557
Smith, Dr. William, Bible Dictionary, on Aretas and Paul, . . .	590, note
Smith, Sir James, Admiral, on the voyage and shipwreck of Paul, 573-580	
Fair Haven, Clauda, Lasea, and Port Phenice, identified, . .	575
All traditions disregarded in investigation,	575, 576
Identification of the place of Paul's shipwreck, at Malta, . .	577-579
Coin of Primate of the Maltese,	578
The harbor Puteoli (or Dicearchia), the modern Puzzuoli, at	
Naples,	580
Spinoza, Benedict, on the negation of miracles,	186
Stanley, Dean Arthur P., epitome of,	588, 589
On Christianity founded on Fact and Truth,	589
Starkie, Justice Thomas, on reconciling conflicting testimonies,	15
Story, Joseph, on the Bible, the source of religion,	503
Strauss, David, absurdity of Christianity without Christ,	120
He is the highest model of religion conceivable,	123
Life requires a miracle for its origin,	199
Demands explanation of working laws of miracles,	204
Denounces the Swoon theory as impossible,	282
Suetonius, the historian, epitome of,	388
Christ the Leader of exiled Jews at Rome,	122
Held Christianity as a "new and deceitful superstition," . .	350
Nero burns Rome, and punishes Christians for his own crime,	362
A criminal carried tablet with accusation,	398
Claudius's advisers were freedmen,	420, * 437
Provincials exiled, were barred from Rome,	422

	PAGE.
Augustus deprived cities of freedom,	443
He referred all appeals to his prætor,	448
He abhorred the title, "Lord," as offensive,	451
Tiberius regarded the title an affront,	451
Transfer of Achaïa and Macedonia to the Roman Senate, 454, 455, 560	
Populace assault Emperor because of famine,	524
Suidas, the geographer, on the designation, Nazarenes and Galileans,	* 349
Sulpicius Severus, on the guilt of Nero in burning Rome,	363
On Christians burned for Nero's crime,	363, 367
Sunday (Sabbath), see Lord's-day,	130-134, 275-279
" <i>Supernatural Religion</i> ," an anonymous work against Christianity,	119

T.

Table of Contemporary Witnesses,	692
Tacitus, the celebrated Roman historian, epitome of,	115, 116
On the advent of the expected Messiah,	34
Christ, the founder of Christianity, put to death by Pontius Pilate,	99, 123, 428
On Nero burning Rome,	315
On Nero's persecution of Christians,	333, 362
Gibbon's confirmation of Tacitus,	363
Mentions Pilate as procurator of Judæa,	428
Felix becomes procurator,	437 note, 438, 497, 498
Census of Roman citizens given,	443
Augustus rejects the title "Lord,"	451
Calamities of the times described,	526
Failure of crops, and famine,	421, 524
Popular indignation at Claudius therefor,	421
Nero sang "Destruction of Troy," over burning Rome,	423
Emperor and Senate exchange territory,	454, 455, 560
One Simon seizes sovereignty over Judæa, on the death of Herod the Great,	471
On the death of Herod Agrippa I,	* 498
Irresistible advance of Christianity,	522, 523
On Titus's siege of Jerusalem,	532
Soldiers at Cæsarea called Augustani,	573 note, and 574 note
Talleyrand, Cardinal, on how to found a religion successfully, . .	290
Talmud, Jewish, epitome of,	21, 22
On Messiah's advent and character,	55
His coming to be signalized by a Star,	66, 72, 73
On the birth of the expected Messiah,	26, 27
The incarnation of the Messiah,	27-29
Time for his birth long since passed,	57, 62
Opprobrious references to Jesus and his mother,	44, 678

	PAGE.
Mentions Jesus in manhood resident in Egypt,	44
Acquired there miraculous powers,	150
Concedes Jesus actually wrought miracles,	44
Jesus mocked and condemned to die,	220
Mentions he was crowned with thorns,	220
The exact time of his crucifixion,	44, 224
The cup of wormwood offered Jesus,	222
On Christ's ascension to heaven,	308
His return encompassed with clouds,	308
Disciples of Jesus mentioned and named,	44, 319
On miracles wrought by the Apostles,	331
The destruction of the Jewish Temple,	44, 539, 540
Jerusalem destroyed and Zion plowed,	539, 540
Sanhedrin removed to Jamnia,	359
It exacted Christian persecutions,	359-361
Edict to expurgate references to Jesus from the Talmud, .	676, 677
On the pre-eminence of James, the Lord's brother,	323, 324
Targum Chaldaic, epitome of,	22, 23
Messiah's advent signalized by a star, and clouds, .	22, 23, 28, 39, 308
Teachings of the Apostles (document Didaché), epitome of,	
119, 674, 675, (Excursus D.)	
On Christian baptism of converts,	127, 128
The Lord's-day as a Christian Sabbath,	133
On the Lord's Supper (Eucharist),	128, 129
Offenses forbidden in apostolic teachings,	356, 357
(Opinions on the Didaché by Dr. Salmon, Dr. Schaff, and	
Bishop Lightfoot),	675
Temple of the Jews destroyed by Titus,	275, 466, 535, 552
Tertullian, Quint. S. F., juriconsult in law and Christian Apolo-	
gist, epitome of,	47, 48
On the Magi or the Wise Men of the East,	74
Christ's ancestral tribe, the tribe of Judah,	58
The enrollment at time of Nativity,	85
On administration of Lord's Supper,	128
On the institution of the Lord's-day,	131
Jews' views of Christ and his miracles,	158
The Jews extorted Christ's crucifixion,	230
Refers to Pilate's report of Christ to Tiberius,	* 426
For the fact, appeals to the archives of the Roman govern-	
ment then existing,	230
Mentions the preternatural darkness,	230
Christ's body watched by a large military guard,	270
Resurrection of Jesus on the third day,	270
His ascension encompassed by clouds,	305
He had spent forty days with disciples in Galilee,	305

	PAGE.
Emperor Tiberius proposed Jesus to the Senate, to be a Roman God,	522
His exposure of an image of a Roman God,	375
His defense of persecuted Christians,	368
Testimony, criteria of,	15
Critics' comparative table of,	690
Value of added witnesses,	14, 15
Canon of divergent testimonies,	15
Historical testimony, its method and characteristics,	13, 14
Thomson, Sir William, on life from life only,	200
Time, notations of, by Jews and Romans,	400, 401
Historical periods, by reigns, of rulers,	401
Time-test ingrained in language,	403-405
Toledo Jeshu, epitome of,	44, 45, 678, 679
On lineage, tribe, and virgin mother of Jesus,	58, 62, 678, 1
On Bethlehem as the place of his birth,	58, 62, 678, 2
On Herod ordering children slain,	69, 680, 3
Jesus, Creator, atoned for men's sins,	126, 221
How Jesus wrought miracles,	150, 680, 4
That Jesus was crowned with thorns,	220
That he was crucified and died on the eve of the Passover,	224, 685, 8, 685, 7, and *
Mentions vinegar given him on the cross,	222, 686, 9
And the time Jesus was buried,	227, 686, 10
On the disciples and his resurrection,	268, 686, 11, 681, 5
Admits Jesus predicted his ascension,	303, 686, 11
Gives number and vocation of disciples,	319, 681, 5
The royal march to Jerusalem,	684, 7
The Jews' conspiracy with Judas,	684, 8, 225
The arrest of Jesus,	685, 8
His death sentence given,	685, 9
The crucifixion of Jesus,	685, 10
Incidents of the crucifixion,	686, 11
Burial of Christ's body,	686, 12
His resurrection and ascension,	686, 13
Institution of the Sabbath,	687, 14
Trajan, Emperor, his Rescript to Pliny on persecution,	366
Transfer of territory in government,	454, 455, 560, 361
Tregelles, S. P., epitome of,	588
On the Scripture as the Word of God,	590
Trench, on Words, as fossil history,	403
Triumphal arch of Vespasian and Titus,	546-548
Tyndall, on life coming out of life,	200
On spontaneous generation,	199

U.

	PAGE.
Ulpian, on treatment of prisoners at Rome,	581, 582
Ulpianus, bodies of executed given to friends,	* 399
Unique condition of Palestine for fifty years,	385, 387-411
Unknown God, the,	567-573

V.

Value of added witnesses,	14, 15
Vergil, epitome of,	21
On the Golden Age,	34
On Messianic anticipation,	24, 25
Versions of the New Testament,	647-649
The Old Latin Version,	647
The Syriac Version,	647
The Peshito Version,	747
The Cureton Version,	648
The Harklean Version,	648
A Syrian Gospel,	648
The Egyptian Versions,	649
The Memphitic Version,	649
The Thebaic Version,	649
The Bashmuric Version,	649
Virgin Mary,	26
On her supposed worship,	† 73
Volney, his exclamation on the ruins of Judæa,	540
Verification of the Books of the New Testament,	587-632

W.

Watson, Dr. H. C. M., on denial of the possibility of miracles,	184
That nature's operations are never varied not verifiable,	191
Washington, George, impossible to govern well without God and the Bible,	503
Webster, Daniel, on our country and the Bible,	503
Gospel of Christ a divine reality,	503
Westcott, Bishop, B. F., epitome of,	48
On the incarnation of Jesus Christ,	49
Christianity involves but creates no difficulties,	144
On the resurrection of Jesus Christ,	289
On the kingship of the tetrarch Antipas,	* 479
On Celsus quoting the Gospels as unquestionable authority,	607
On the Muratorian Canon,	616
How Sacred Books became canonical,	653, 656
Whately, Richard, epitome of,	237
On how to distinguish between truth and fabrication,	415
Whedon, Dr. D. D., on the kingship of Antipas, tetrarch,	* 479

	PAGE.
Whiston, on Daniel's prediction fulfilled in the Roman-Jewish war,	534
Wieseler, on the astronomy of the Star of the Nativity,	75
Woolsey, T. J., on Roman citizenship,	445
Worship of the Virgin Mary,	73†
Z.	
Zoroaster, and the Nestorians, on the Star and the Magi,	72
Zumt, Augustus W., researches on Quirinius's enrollments,	79, 80

DEC 30 1903


Deacidified using the Bookkeeper process.
Neutralizing agent: Magnesium Oxide
Treatment Date: June 2005

Preservation Technologies
A WORLD LEADER IN PAPER PRESERVATION

111 Thomson Park
Cranberry Township, PA 16810
(724) 779-2111

BS
2375

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 014 383 316 1

